00067815

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY-400 023.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

SUPERNATURAL RELIGION:

AN INQUIRY

INTO

THE REALITY OF DIVINE REVELATION.

67815

VOL. III.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.,
1877.

[*The Right of Translation is Reserved.*]

00067815

"Credulity is as real, if not so great, a sin as unbelief."

Archbishop Trench,

NOTES ON THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD, *8th ed.* p. 27.

"The abnegation of reason is not the evidence of faith, but the confession of despair."

Canon Lightfoot,

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS, *4th ed.* p. ix.

CONTENTS

OF

THE THIRD VOLUME.

PART I.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE 1

CHAPTER II.

EVIDENCE REGARDING THE AUTHORSHIP 31

CHAPTER III.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK. DESIGN AND COMPOSITION . . 62

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY 109

CHAPTER V.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. STEPHEN THE MARTYR 146

CHAPTER VI.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. PHILIP IN SAMARIA. PETER AND CORNELIUS 179

CHAPTER VII.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. PAUL THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES 201

PART II.

THE DIRECT EVIDENCE FOR MIRACLES.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE
THE EPISTLES AND THE APOCALYPSE 321

CHAPTER II.

THE EVIDENCE OF PAUL 325

PART III.

THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION.

CHAPTER I.

THE RELATION OF EVIDENCE TO ITS SUBJECT 398

CHAPTER II.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE GOSPELS 409

CHAPTER III.

THE EVIDENCE OF PAUL 482

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETY

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE

REALITY OF DIVINE REVELATION

PART I.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

CHAPTER I.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

Before we proceed to examine the evidence for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation which is furnished by the last historical book of the New Testament, entitled the "Acts of the Apostles," it is well that we should briefly recall to mind some characteristics of the document, which most materially affect the value of any testimony emanating from it. Whilst generally asserting the resurrection of Jesus, and his bodily ascension, regarding which indeed it adds fresh details, this work presents to us a new cycle of miracles, and so profusely introduces supernatural agency into the history of the early church that, in comparison with it, the Gospels seem almost sober narratives. The Apostles are instructed and comforted by visions and revelations, and they, and all who believe, are filled with the Holy Spirit and speak with other tongues. The Apostles are delivered from

prison and from bonds by angels or by an earthquake. Men fall dead or are smitten with blindness at their rebuke. They heal the sick, raise the dead, and handkerchiefs brought from their bodies cure diseases and expel evil spirits.

As a general rule, any document so full of miraculous episodes and supernatural occurrences would, without hesitation, be characterized as fabulous and incredible, and would not, by any sober-minded reader, be for a moment accepted as historical. There is no other testimony for these miracles. Let the reader endeavour to form some conception of the nature and amount of evidence necessary to establish the truth of statements antecedently so incredible, and compare it with the testimony of this solitary and anonymous document, the character and value of which we shall now proceed more closely to examine.

It is generally admitted, and indeed it is undeniable, that no distinct and unequivocal reference to the Acts of the Apostles, and to Luke as their author, occurs in the writings of Fathers before one by Irenæus[1] about the end of the second century. Passages are, however, pointed out in earlier writings as indicating the use and consequent existence of our document, all of which we shall now examine.

[1] Adv. Hær., iii. 14, §§ 1, 2; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 124; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. 1. p. 273 f.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 71 f.; *Guericke*, Gesammtgesch. N. T., p. 279 ff.; *Kirchhofer*, Quellensamml. N. T. Canons, p. 161, anm. 2; *Meyer*, Kr. exeg. H'buch. üb. die Apostelgeschichte, 4te Aufl., 1870, p. 1 f.; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 337, anm. 2; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 118, anm. 2; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 254; *Zeller*, Die Apostelgeschichte, 1854, p. 71.

Several of these occur in the "Epistle to the Corinthians," ascribed to Clement of Rome. The first, immediately compared with the passage to which it is supposed to be a reference,[1] is as follows:—

Epistle, c. ii.	Acts xx. 35.
Ye were all humble-minded, not boasting at all, subjecting yourselves rather than subjecting others, more gladly giving than receiving.	. . . . and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, that he himself said: It is more blessed to give than to receive.
Πάντες τε ἐταπεινοφρονεῖτε, μηδὲν ἀλαζονευόμενοι, ὑποτασσόμενοι, μᾶλλον ἢ ὑποτάσσοντες, ἥδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες. . . .	. . . . μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν· Μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν.

The words of the Epistle are not a quotation, but merely occur in the course of an address. They do not take the form of an axiom, but are a comment on the conduct of the Corinthians, which may have been suggested either by written or oral tradition, or by moral maxims long before current in heathen philosophy.[2] It is unnecessary to enter minutely into this, however, or to point out the linguistic differences between the two passages, for one point alone settles the question. In the Acts: the saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," is distinctly introduced as a quotation of

[1] *Dressel*, Patr. Ap. Opp., 1863, p. 48; *Hefele*, Patr. Ap. Opp., 1842, p. 29; *Jacobson*, Patr. Apost., 1863, i. p. 11; *Kirchhofer*, Quellens. N. T. Canons, p. 162; *Lardner*, Credibility, &c., Works, 1788, ii. p. 34; *Lightfoot*, The Epistles of S. Clement of Rome, 1869, p. 36. Cf. *Meyer*, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 453.

[2] Εὖ ποιεῖν ἥδιόν ἐστι τοῦ πάσχειν. *Epicur. ap. Plut.* Mor. p. 778 c. Errat enim si quis beneficium libentius accipit quam reddit. *Seneca*, Epist. lxxxi. 17. Μᾶλλόν ἐστι τοῦ ἐλευθερίου τὸ διδόναι οἷς δεῖ ἢ λαμβάνειν ὅθεν δεῖ, καὶ μὴ λαμβάνειν ὅθεν οὐ δεῖ. τῆς γὰρ ἀρετῆς μᾶλλον τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν· ἢ τὸ εὖ πάσχειν. *Aristotle*, Eth. Nicom. iv. 1. Δωρεῖσθαι καὶ διδόναι κρεῖττον ἢ λαμβάνειν. Artemidor. Oneirocr. iv. 3. Cf. *Wetstein*, N. T. Gr. l. c.

"words of the Lord Jesus," and the exhortation "to remember" them, conveys the inference that they were well known. They must either have formed part of Gospels now no longer extant, as they are not found in ours, or have been familiar as the unwritten tradition of sayings of the Master. In either case, if the passage in the Epistle be a reference to these words at all, it must be held a reference to an apocryphal gospel, or to tradition, and it cannot reasonably be maintained that they must necessarily have been derived from a work which itself distinctly quotes them from another source. It would be against every principle of evidence, under such circumstances, to conclude the passage to be an allusion to this special work, of whose previous existence we have no independent evidence.[1] The slight coincidence in the expression, without indication that any particular passage is in the mind of the author, and without any mention of the Acts, therefore, is no evidence whatever of the existence of that work.

A few critics point to some parts of the following passage as showing acquaintance with Acts:—"Through jealousy Paul also pointed out the way to the prize of patience, having borne chains seven times, having been put to flight, having been stoned; having become a preacher both in the East and in the West, he gained the noble renown due to his faith; having taught the whole world righteousness, and come to the extremity of the West, and having suffered martyrdom by command of the rulers, he was thus removed from the world and

[1] *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 269; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 73; *Ekker*, Disq. crit. et hist. de Clem. Rom. priore ad Cor. epist., 1854, p. 59; *Hilgenfeld*, Die apost. Väter, 1853, p. 73; N. T. extra Can. recept. 1866, i., p. 78; *Zeller*, Apostolgesch., p. 9.

went to the holy place, having become a most eminent example of patience."[1] The slightest impartial consideration, however, must convince any one that this passage does not indicate the use of the "Acts of the Apostles." The Epistle speaks of seven imprisonments, of some of which the Acts make no mention, and this must, therefore, have been derived from another source.[2] The reference to his "coming to the extremity of the West" (*τέρμα τῆς δύσεως*), whatever interpretation be put upon it, and to his death, obviously carries the history further than the Acts, and cannot have been derived from that document.

The last passage, which, it is affirmed,[3] shows acquaintance with the Acts of the Apostles is the following: "But what shall we say regarding David who hath obtained a good report (*ἐπὶ τῷ μεμαρτυρημένῳ Δαυείδ*)? unto whom (*προς ὃν*) God said: 'I found a man after mine own heart, David, the son of Jesse: in everlasting mercy I anointed him.'"[4] This is said to be derived from Acts xiii. 22: "And when he removed him

[1] *Διὰ ζῆλον καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον [ὑπέδει]ξεν, ἑπτάκις δεσμὰ φορέσας, φυγαδευθείς, λιθασθείς, κήρυξ γενόμενος ἔν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει, τὸ γενναῖον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος ἔλαβεν, δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών· καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου καὶ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον ἐπορεύθη, ὑπομονῆς γενόμενος μέγιστος ὑπογραμμός.* c. v.

[2] *Dressel*, Patr. Ap., p. 52; *Ekker*, Disq., p. 64; *Hilgenfeld*, Die ap. Väter, p. 109, anm. 13; N. T. extra Can. recept., i. p. 79; *Lightfoot*, Eps. of S. Clement of Rome, p. 48; *Lipsius*, De Clementis Rom. Ep. and Cor. priore Disq., 1855, p. 128, Annot. 3: *Zeller*, Apg., p. 9.

[3] *Dressel*, Patr. Ap., p. 65; *Hefele*, Patr. Ap., p. 40; *Lightfoot*, Eps. of S. Clem. p. 79; *Tregelles*, Can. Murat., p. 82; *Witton*, Clem. Rom., p. 90. Cf. *Lardner*, Credibility, &c., Works, 1788, ii. p. 34; *Kirchhofer*, Quellens., p. 161.

[4] *Τί δὲ εἴπωμεν ἐπὶ τῷ μεμαρτυρημένῳ Δαυείδ; πρὸς ὃν εἶπεν ὁ θεός, Εὗρον ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, Δαυεὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν.* c. xviii.

he raised up to them David for king; to whom also he gave testimony (ᾧ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας) : I found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart, who will do all my will."[1] The passage, however, is compounded of two quotations loosely made from the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, from which all the quotations in the Epistle are taken. Ps. lxxxviii. 20: "I found David my servant; in holy mercy I anointed him."[2] And 1 Sam. xiii.: "A man after his own heart."[3] Clement of Alexandria quotes this passage from the Epistle, and for "in everlasting mercy" reads "with holy oil" (ἐν ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ) as in the Psalm.[4] Although, therefore, our Alexandrian MS. of the Epistle has the reading which we have given above, even if we suppose that the Alexandrian Clement may have found a more correct version in his MS., the argument would not be affected. The whole similarity lies in the insertion of "the son of Jesse," but this was a most common addition to any mention of David, and by the completion of the passage from the Psalm, the omission of "who will do all my will," the peculiar phrase of the Acts, as well as the difference of introductory expressions, any connection between the two is severed, and it is apparent that the quotation of the Epistle may legitimately be referred to the Septuagint,[5] with which it agrees much more closely than

[1] Καὶ μεταστήσας αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν τὸν Δαυὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα, ᾧ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας. Εὗρον Δαυεὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου. Acts xiii. 22.

[2] Εὗρον Δαυὶδ τὸν δοῦλόν μου, ἐν ἐλέει ἁγίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν. The Alexandrian MS. reads ἐν ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ μου. The quotation given is the reading of the Vatican Codex.

[3] ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ.

[4] *Stromata*, iv. 17.

[5] *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., p. 72 f.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 9. Cf. *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 269; *Hilgenfeld*, Die ap. Väter, p. 101.

with the Acts. In no case could such slight coincidences prove acquaintance with the Acts of the Apostles.[1]

Only one passage of the "Epistle of Barnabas" is referred to by any one[2] as indicating acquaintance with the Acts. It is as follows, c. 7: "If therefore the son of God, being Lord, and about to judge quick and dead (*καὶ μελλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς*) suffered," &c. This is compared with Acts x. 42 . . . "and to testify that it is he who has been appointed by God judge of quick and dead" (*ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ὡρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν*). Lardner, who compares the expression of the Epistle with Acts, equally compares it with that in 2 Tim. iv. 1 . . . "and Christ Jesus who is about to judge the quick and dead" (*μελλοντος κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς*), to which it is more commonly referred,[3] and 1 Pet. iv. 5 . . . "to him who is ready to judge quick and dead" (*κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς*). He adds, however: "It is not possible to say, what text he refers to, though that in Timothy has the same words. But perhaps there is no proof that he refers to any. This was an article known to every common Christian; whereas this writer (whoever he be) was able to teach the Christian religion, and that without respect to any written gospels or epistles."[4] It is scarcely necessary to add anything to this. There is of course no trace of the use of Acts in the Epistle.[5]

[1] *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., p. 72 f.; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 337, anm. 2; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. Proleg. p. 20; *Hilgenfeld*, Ap. Väter, p. 108; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 9; *Dr. Westcott* does not claim any: On the Canon, 1875, p. 48, note 2.

[2] *Kirchhofer*, Quellens. N. T. Can., p. 161.

[3] Cf. *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 48, n. 2.

[4] Credibility, &c., Works, 1788, ii, p. 17.

[5] *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 72; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 337, an. 2; *Donaldson*, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 242.

It is asserted that there is a "clear allusion"[1] to Acts in the Pastor of Hermas. The passages may be compared as follows:

Vis. iv. 2.	Acts iv. 12.
. . . . and didst open thy heart to the Lord, believing that by no other couldst thou be saved than by the great and glorious name.	And there is salvation in no other: for neither is there any other name under the heaven that has been given among men whereby we must be saved.
. . . . . καὶ τὴν καρδίαν σου ἤνοιξας πρὸς τὸν κύριον, πιστεύσας ὅτι δι' οὐδενὸς δύνῃ σωθῆναι εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἐνδόξου ὀνόματος.	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἡ σωτηρία· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς.

The slightest comparison of these passages suffices to show that the one is not dependent on the other. The Old Testament is full of passages in which the name of the Lord is magnified as the only source of safety and salvation. In the Pauline Epistles likewise there are numerous passages of a similar tenour. For instance, the passage from Joel ii. 32, is quoted Rom. x. 13: "For whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται).[2] There was in fact no formula more current either amongst the Jews or in the early Church; and there is no legitimate ground for tracing such an expression to the Acts of the Apostles.[3]

The only other passage which is quoted[4] as indicating

[1] *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 198 f.

[2] The same passage is quoted, Acts ii. 21. Cf. Ephes. i. 20, 21; Philip. ii. 9 ff.; 1 John v. 13 f.

[3] *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 10; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 269. Neither *Kirchhofer* nor *Lardner* advances the passage at all.

[4] *Lardner*, Works, ii. p. 56. This is not advanced by *Kirchhofer*, nor does *Dr. Westcott* refer to it. Even *Hefele* does not suggest a reference.

acquaintance with Acts is the following, which we at once contrast with the supposed parallel:

Simil. ix. 28.	Acts v. 41.
But ye who suffer on account of the name ought to praise God, that God deemed ye worthy to bear his name, and that all your sins may be redeemed.	So they departed rejoicing from the presence of the council that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name.
ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ πάσχοντες ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος δοξάζειν ὀφείλετε τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἀξίους ὑμᾶς ἡγήσατο ὁ θεὸς ἵνα τούτου τὸ ὄνομα βαστάζητε, καὶ πᾶσαι ὑμῶν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἰαθῶσιν.	*οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ συνεδρίου, ὅτι κατηξιώθησαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀτιμασθῆναι.*

Here again a formula is employed which is common throughout the New Testament, and which, applied as it is here to those who were persecuted, we have reason to believe was in general use in the early Church. It is almost unnecessary to point out any examples. Everywhere "the name" of God or of Jesus is the symbol used to represent the concrete idea, and in the heavenly Jerusalem of the Apocalypse the servants of God and of the Lamb are to have "his name" on their foreheads. The one expression, however, which is peculiar in the passage: "counted worthy,"—in the Acts *κατηξιώθησαν*, and in the Pastor *ἀξίους ἡγήσατο*,—is a perfectly natural and simple one, the use of which cannot be exclusively conceded to the Acts of the Apostles. It is found frequently in the Pauline Epistles, as for instance in 2 Thes. i. 5, where, after saying that they give thanks to God for them and glory in the churches of God for the patience and faith with which the Thessalonians endure persecutions, the writer continues: "which is a token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye *may be counted worthy*

(καταξιωθῆναι) of the kingdom of God, for which ye also *suffer* (πάσχετε);" and again, in the same chapter, v. 11, 12, "Wherefore we also pray always for you that our God *may count you worthy* (ἀξιώσῃ) of the calling, and fulfil all good pleasure of goodness and work of faith with power; *that the name of our Lord Jesus may be glorified in you* (ἐνδοξασθῇ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν)," &c. The passage we are examining cannot be traced to the "Acts of the Apostles."[1] It must be obvious to all that the Pastor of Hermas does not present any evidence even of the existence of the Acts at the time it was written.[2]

Only two passages in the Epistles of pseudo-Ignatius are pointed out as indicating acquaintance with the Acts, and even these are not advanced by many critics. We have already so fully discussed these Epistles that no more need now be said. We must pronounce them spurious in all their recensions and incapable of affording evidence upon any point earlier than towards the end of the second century. Those, however, who would still receive as genuine the testimony of the three Syriac Epistles must declare that they do not present any trace of the existence of the Acts, inasmuch as the two passages adduced to show the use of that work do not occur in those letters. They are found in the shorter recension of the Epistles to the Smyrnæans and Philadelphians. We might, therefore, altogether refuse to examine the passages, but in order to show the exact nature of the case made out by apologists, we shall briefly refer to

[1] *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 73 f.

[2] *Donaldson*, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., i. p. 306; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 269; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 337, anm. 2; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 9 f.

them. We at once compare the first with its supposed parallel.[1]

Ep. to Smyrn. iii.	Acts x. 41.
But after the resurrection he did eat and drink with them, as in the flesh, although spiritually united to the Father.	. . . . even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.
Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικὸς, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ πατρί.	*. . . . ἡμῖν οἵτινες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.*

There is nothing in this passage which bears any peculiar analogy to the Acts, for the statement is a simple reference to a tradition which is also embodied both in the third Synoptic[2] and in the fourth Gospel;[3] and the mere use of the common words *φάγειν* and *πίνειν* could not prove anything. The passage occurs in the Epistle immediately after a quotation, said by Jerome to be taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, relating an appearance of Jesus to "those who were with Peter," in which Jesus is represented as making them handle him in order to convince them that he is not an incorporeal spirit.[4] The quotation bears considerable affinity to the narrative in the third Synoptic (xxiv. 39), at the close of which Jesus is represented as eating with the disciples. It is highly probable that the Gospel from which the writer of the Epistle quoted contained the same detail, to which this would naturally be a direct

[1] *Lardner*, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 73 f.; *Kirchhofer*, Quellens., 162; *Zahn*, Ignat. v. Ant., 1873, p. 600.

Dr. Westcott does not claim either this or the second (On the Canon, p. 48, note 2), and Hefele merely suggests comparison with Acts (Patr. Ap., p. 103, p. 98).

[2] Luke xxiv. 42 ff.

[3] John xxi. 12 ff.

[4] Quoted S. R., 6th ed., i. p. 272.

descriptive reference. In any case it affords no evidence of the existence of the Acts of the Apostles.[1]

The second passage, which is still more rarely advanced,[2] is as follows:—

Ep. to Philad. ii.	Acts xx. 29.
For many wolves (which appear) worthy of belief, make captive by evil pleasure the runners in the course of God.	I know that after my departing grievous wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock.
πολλοὶ γὰρ λύκοι ἀξιόπιστοι ἡδονῇ κακῇ αἰχμαλωτίζουσιν τοὺς θεοδρόμους.	ἐγὼ οἶδα ὅτι εἰσελεύσονται μετὰ τὴν ἄφιξίν μου λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου.

The only point of coincidence between these two passages is the use of the word "wolves." In the Epistle the expression is πολλοὶ λύκοι ἀξιόπιστοι, whilst in Acts it is λύκοι βαρεῖς. Now the image is substantially found in the Sermon on the Mount, one form of which is given in the first Synoptic, vii. 15, 16, and which undeniably must have formed part of many of the Gospels which are mentioned by the writer of the third Synoptic. We find Justin Martyr twice quoting another form of the saying: "For many (πολλοὶ) shall arrive in my name, outwardly indeed clothed in sheep's skins, but inwardly being ravening wolves (λύκοι ἅρπαγες)."[3] The use of the term as applied to men was certainly common in the early Church. The idea expressed in the Epistle is more closely found in 2 Timothy iii. 1 ff., in the description of those who are to come in the last days, and who will (v. 6) creep into the houses and lead captive (αἰχμαλωτίζοντες) silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts." The pas-

[1] *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 51; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., 1870, p. 1; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 337, anm. 2; *Hilgenfeld*, Die ap. Väter, p. 280 f.

[2] *Jacobson*, Patr. Ap., ii. 418.

[3] See discussion of the quotation, S. R., i. p. 357, note 1, p. 380 f.

sage cannot be traced to the Acts,[1] and the Ignatian Epistles, spurious though they be, do not present any evidence of the existence of that work.[2]

Only two sentences are pointed out in the "Epistle of Polycarp" as denoting acquaintance with the Acts. The first and only one of these on which much stress is laid is the following :—[3]

Epistle i.	Acts ii. 24.
Whom God raised (ἤγειρε), having loosed the pains of hell (ᾅδου).	Whom God raised up (ἀνέστησε), having loosed the pains of death (θανάτου).
ὃν ἤγειρεν ὁ θεὸς λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου.	ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου.[4]

It will be obvious to all that, along with much similarity, there is likewise divergence between these sentences. In the first phrase the use of ἤγειρε in the Epistle separates it from the supposed parallel, in which the word is ἀνέστησε. The number of passages in the Pauline Epistles corresponding with it are legion (e.g. 2 Cor. iv. 14, Ephes. i. 20). The second member of the sentence, which is of course the more important, is in reality, we contend, a reference to the very Psalm quoted in Acts immediately after the verse before us, couched in not unusual phraseology. Psalm xvi. 10 (Sept. xv.), reads:

[1] *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 51.

[2] *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. 1. p. 274; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 51 f.; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., 4te Aufl., p. 1; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 337, anm. 2. Cf. *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 74.

[3] *Dressel*, Patr. Ap., p. 377; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 270; *Donaldson*, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., 1864, i. p. 197; *Hefele*, Patr. Ap., p. 117; *Jacobson*, Patr. Ap., ii. p. 525; *Kirchhofer*, Quellens., p. 162; *Lardner*, Works, ii. p. 93; *Tregelles*, Can. Murat., p. 82; *Westcott*, Canon, 1874, p. 48, note 2; *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 52 f. Cf. *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 74 f.

[4] It is right to point out that the Cod. Bezæ (D) reads ᾅδου here, although all the older, and almost all other, MSS. have θανάτου.

"For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell" (ᾅδην).[1] In Ps. xviii. 5 (Sept. xvii. 5) we have, "The pains of hell (ὠδῖνες ᾅδου) compassed me about."[2] The difference between the ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου of the Epistle and the ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου of the Acts is so distinct that, finding a closer parallel in the Psalms to which reference is obviously made in both works, it is quite impossible to trace the phrase necessarily to the Acts. Such a passage cannot prove the use of that work,[3] but, if it could, we might inquire what evidence for the authorship and trustworthiness of the Acts could be deduced from the circumstance?[4]

The second passage, referred to by a few writers,[5] is as follows:—

Epistle viii.	Acts v. 41.
Let us therefore become imitators of his patience, and if we suffer for his name, let us praise him.	So they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name.
Μιμηταὶ οὖν γενώμεθα τῆς ὑπομονῆς αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐὰν πάσχωμεν διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, δοξάζωμεν αὐτόν.	*Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ συνεδρίου, ὅτι κατηξιώθησαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀτιμασθῆναι.*

It is scarcely necessary to do more than contrast these passages to show how little the "Epistle of Polycarp" can witness for the "Acts of the Apostles." We have already examined another supposed reference to this very passage, and the expressions in the Epistle, whilst scarcely presenting a single point of linguistic analogy to

[1] Cod. E reads ᾅδου.

[2] In the Sept. version of Job, xxxix. 2, the expression ὠδῖνας δὲ αὐτῶν ἔλυσας occurs.

[3] *Hilgenfeld*, Ap. v. 284; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. 1, p. 274.

[4] For the date and character of the Epistle, see discussion, S. R., i. p. 274 ff.

[5] *Jacobson*, Patr. Ap., ii. p. 541. Cf. *Dressel*, Patr. Ap., p. 386; *Hefele*, Patr. Ap., p. 120.

the sentence in the Acts, only tend to show how common and natural such language was in the early Church in connection with persecution. Whilst we constantly meet with the thought expressed by the writer of the Epistle throughout the writings of the New Testament, we may more particularly point to the first Petrine epistle for further instances of this tone of exhortation to those suffering persecution for the cause. For instance, 1 Pet. ii. 19 ff., and again iii. 14,[1] "But if ye even suffer (πάσχοιτε) for righteousness' sake, blessed are ye." In the next chapter the tone is still more closely analogous. Speaking of persecutions, the writer says, iv. 13, ". . . . but according as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings rejoice," &c. &c. 14. "If ye are reproached in Christ's name (ἐν ὀνόματι X.) blessed are ye, for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you." 15. "For let none of you suffer (πασχέτω) as a murderer," &c. &c. 16. "But if as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but *let him praise God* in this name (δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ)" &c. &c. Nothing but evidential destitution could rely upon the expression in the "Epistle of Polycarp" to show acquaintance with Acts.

Few apologists point out with confidence any passages from the voluminous writings of Justin Martyr, as indicating the use of the Acts of the Apostles. We may, however, quote such expressions as the more undaunted amongst them venture to advance. The first of these is the following:[2] "For the Jews having the prophecies and ever expecting the Christ to come knew him not (ἠγνόησαν), and not only so, but they also maltreated him. But

[1] Ver. 13, according to some MSS., reads: "And who is he that will harm you, if ye become *imitators* (μιμηταὶ) of the good?"

[2] *Lardner*, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 122; *Kirchhofer*, Quellens. N. T., Can., p. 163.

the Gentiles, who had never heard anything regarding the Christ until his Apostles, having gone forth from Jerusalem, declared the things concerning him, and delivered the prophecies, having been filled with joy and faith, renounced their idols and dedicated themselves to the unbegotten God through the Christ."[1] This is compared with Acts xiii. 27, "For they that dwell at Jerusalem and their rulers not knowing this (man) (*τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες*) nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath day, fulfilled them by their judgment of him," &c. 48. "But the Gentiles, hearing, rejoiced and glorified the word of the Lord," &c.[2] We may at once proceed to give the next passage. In the Dialogue with Trypho, Justin has by quotations from the prophets endeavoured to show that the sufferings of Christ, and also the glory of his second advent had been foretold, and Trypho replies: "Supposing these things to be even as thou sayest, and that it was foretold that Christ was to suffer (*ὅτι παθητὸς Χριστὸς προεφητεύθη μελλειν εἶναι*), and has been called a Stone, and after his first coming in which it had been announced that he was to suffer, should come in glory, and become judge of all, and eternal king and priest;" &c.,[3] and in another place, "For

[1] Ἰουδαῖοι γὰρ ἔχοντες τὰς προφητείας καὶ ἀεὶ προσδοκήσαντες τὸν Χριστὸν παραγενησόμενον ἠγνόησαν, οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρεχρήσαντο· οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν μηδέποτε μηδὲν ἀκούσαντες περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μέχρις οὗ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐξελθόντες ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐμήνυσαν τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς προφητείας παρέδωκαν, πληρωθέντες χαρᾶς καὶ πίστεως τοῖς εἰδώλοις ἀπετάξαντο καὶ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνέθηκαν. Apol. i. 49.

[2] Acts xiii. 27: Οἱ γὰρ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας κρίναντες ἐπλήρωσαν· κ. τ. λ. 48. ἀκούοντα δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ἔχαιρον καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου, κ. τ. λ.

[3] Ἔστω καὶ ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχοντα ὡς λέγεις, καὶ ὅτι παθητὸς Χριστὸς προεφητεύθη μέλλειν εἶναι, καὶ λίθος κέκληται, καὶ ἔνδοξος μετὰ τὴν πρώτην αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν,

if it had been obscurely declared by the prophets that the Christ should suffer (*παθητὸς γενησόμενος ὁ Χριστὸς*) and after these things be lord of all," &c.[1] This is compared with Acts xxvi. 22, ". . . . saying nothing except those things which the prophets and Moses said were to come to pass, (23) whether the Christ should suffer (*εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός*), whether, the first out of the resurrection from the dead, he is about to proclaim light unto the people and to the Gentiles."[2] It is only necessary to quote these passages to show how impossible it is to maintain that they show the use of the Acts by Justin. He simply sets forth from the prophets, direct, the doctrines which formed the great text of the early Church. Some of the warmest supporters of the canon admit the "uncertainty" of such coincidences, and do not think it worth while to advance them. There are one or two still more distant analogies sometimes pointed out which do not require more particular notice.[3] There is no evidence whatever that Justin was acquainted with the Acts of the Apostles.[4]

ἐν ᾗ παθητὸς φαίνεσθαι κεκήρυκτο, ἐλευσόμενος καὶ κριτὴς πάντων λοιπόν, καὶ αἰώνιος βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς γενησόμενος· κ. τ. λ. Dial. 36.

[1] *Εἰ γὰρ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν παρακεκαλυμμένως κεκήρυκτο παθητὸς γενησόμενος ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πάντων κυριεύσων· κ. τ. λ.* Dial. 76.

[2] Acts xxvi. 22. . . . *οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων ὧν τε οἱ προφῆται ἐλάλησαν μελλόντων γίνεσθαι καὶ Μωϋσῆς, 23. εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει καταγγέλλειν τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.*

[3] Apol. i. 50, cf. Acts i. 8 f.; Apol. i. 40, cf. Acts iv. 27; Apol. ii. 10, cf. Acts xvii. 23; Dial. 8, cf. Acts xxvi. 29; Dial. 20, cf. Acts x. 14; Dial. 68, cf. Acts ii. 30.

[4] *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 49 f.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 75; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. 1, p. 274; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 1 f. Dean *Alford* says: "Nor are there any references in Justin Martyr which, fairly considered, belong to this book." Greek Test., 1871, Proleg. ii. p. 20. *Dr. Westcott* says: "The references to the *Acts* are uncertain;" and he merely illustrates this by referring to the first of the passages discussed in the text. On the Canon, 1875, p. 168, note 3. *Donaldson*, Hist. Chr. Lit. and Doctr., ii. p. 329.

Some apologists[1] claim Hegesippus as evidence for the existence of the Acts, on the strength of the following passages in the fragment of his book preserved by Eusebius. He puts into the mouth of James the Just, whilst being martyred, the expression: "I beseech (thee) Lord God, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." This is compared with the words said to have been uttered by the martyr Stephen, Acts vii. 60, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." The passage is more commonly advanced as showing acquaintance with Luke xxiii. 34, and we have already discussed it.[2] Lardner apparently desires it to do double duty, but it is scarcely worth while seriously to refer to the claim here. The passage more generally relied upon, though that also is only advanced by a few,[3] is the following, "This man was a faithful witness both to Jews and Greeks that Jesus is the Christ,"[4] (*Μάρτυς οὗτος ἀληθὴς Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησι γεγένηται, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν*). This is compared with Acts xx. 21, where Paul is represented as saying of himself, ". . . . testifying fully both to Jews and Greeks repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ" (*Διαμαρτυρόμενος Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησιν τὴν εἰς θεὸν μετάνοιαν, καὶ πίστιν εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν* I. X.). The two passages are totally different both in sense and language, and that the use of Acts is deduced from so distant an analogy only serves to show the slightness of the evidence with which apologists have to be content.

[1] *Lardner*, Credibility, Works, ii. p. 142.

[2] S. R., ii. p. 438 f.

[3] *Lardner*, Credibility, Works, ii. 142; *Westcott*, On the Canon, 4th ed., p. 205. Dr. Westcott, however, merely says: "There are forms of expression corresponding to passages in . . . . and in the Acts which can scarcely be attributed to chance."

[4] *Eusebius*, H. E., ii. 23.

Papias need not long detain us, for it is freely admitted by most divines that he does not afford evidence of any value that he was acquainted with the Acts. For the sake of completeness we may however refer to the points which are sometimes mentioned. A fragment of the work of Papias is preserved giving an account of the death of Judas, which differs materially both from the account in the first Synoptic and in Acts i. 18 f.[1] Judas is represented as having gone about the world a great example of impiety, for his body having swollen so much that he could not pass where a chariot easily passed, he was crushed by the chariot so that his entrails emptied out (*ὥστε τὰ ἔγκατα αὐτοῦ ἐκκενωθῆναι*). Apollinaris of Laodicæa quotes this passage to show that Judas did not die when he hung himself, but subsequently met with another fate, in this way reconciling the statements in the Gospel and Acts.[2] He does not say that Papias used the story for this purpose, and it is fundamentally contradictory to the account in Acts i. 18, 19. "Now this man purchased a field with the reward of the unrighteousness, and falling headlong burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out" (*καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ*). It is scarcely necessary to argue that the passage does not indicate any acquaintance with Acts[3] as some few critics are inclined to assert.[4] The

[1] S. R., i. p. 482.

[2] *Routh*, Reliq. Sacr., i. p. 25 f.

[3] *Overbeck*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1867, p. 39 ff. Cf. *Steitz*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1868, p. 87 ff.; *Meyer*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 2, anm. * * Dr. Westcott says: "In his account of the fate of Judas Iscariot there is a remarkable divergence from the narrative in Matth. xxvii. 5, and Acts i. 18." On the Canon, 4th ed., p. 77, n. 1.

[4] *Zahn*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1866, p. 680 ff. Dr. Lightfoot says: "But there are indications, however indecisive, that Papias did use the writings of St. Luke." And further on, after quoting the passage about Judas,

next analogy pointed out is derived from the statement of Eusebius that Papias mentions a wonderful story which he had heard from the daughters of Philip (whom Eusebius calls "the Apostle,") regarding a dead man raised to life.[1] In Acts xxi. 8, 9, it is stated that Philip the evangelist had four daughters. It is scarcely conceivable that this should be advanced as an indication that Papias knew the Acts. The last point is that Eusebius says: "And again (he narrates) another marvel regarding Justus who was surnamed Barsabas; how he drank a baneful poison and by the grace of the Lord sustained no harm. But that this Justus, after the Ascension of the Saviour, the holy apostles appointed with Matthias, and that they prayed (on the occasion) of the filling up of their number by lot instead of the traitor Judas, the scripture of the Acts thus relates: 'And they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And they prayed and said,' &c."[2] Whatever argument can be deduced from this, obviously rests entirely upon the fact that Papias is said to have referred to Justus who was named Barsabas, for of course the last sentence is added by Eusebius himself, and has nothing to do with Papias. This is fairly admitted by Lardner and others. Lardner says: "Papias does undoubtedly give some confirmation to the history of the Acts of the Apostles, in what he says of Philip; and especially in what he says of Justus, called

and mentioning the view of Apollinaris that it reconciles the accounts in the first Gospel and in the Acts, he continues: "It is too much to assume that Papias himself repeated the tradition with this aim, but the resemblance to the account in the Acts is worthy of notice." Contemporary Rev., vol. v., 1867, p. 415.

[1] H. E., iii. 39.

[2] H. E., iii. 39.

Barsabas. But I think it cannot be affirmed, that he did particularly mention, or refer to, the book of the Acts. For I reckon, it is Eusebius himself who adds that quotation out of the Acts, upon occasion of what Papias had written of the before-mentioned Barsabas." [1]. There is no evidence worthy of serious attention that Papias was acquainted with the Acts.[2]

No one seriously pretends that the Clementine Homilies afford any evidence of the use or existence of the Acts; and few, if any, claim the Epistle to Diognetus as testimony for it.[3] We may, however, quote the only passage which is pointed out. " . . . . these who hold the view that they present them (offerings) to God as needing them might more rightly esteem it foolishness and not worship of God. For he who made the heaven and the earth, and all things in them, and who supplies to us all whatever we need, can himself be in need of none of those things which he himself presents to those who imagine that they give (to him)." [4] This is

[1] Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 113. *Kirchhofer* makes a similar statement, Quellens., p. 163, anm. 1. Dr. Lightfoot says: "Other points of affinity to the Acts are his mention of Justus Barsabas, and his relations with the daughters of Philip." Contemp. Rev., vol. v., 1867, p. 415. Such "indications" he may indeed well characterise as "indecisive." Dr. Westcott says: "Dr. Lightfoot notices some slight indications of Papias' use of the writings of St. Luke (in the article quoted above), but I do not think that much stress can be laid on them." On the Canon, 4th ed., p. 77, note 1.

[2] *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 11; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 75; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 337, anm. 2; *Alford*, Greek Test., 6th ed., ii. Proleg., p. 20; *Overbeck*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1867, p. 39 ff.; *Westcott*, On the Canon, p. 77.

[3] Dr. Westcott merely speaks of "coincidences of language more or less evident with the Acts," &c., &c., referring to c. iii. (Acts xvii. 24, 25) as "worthy of remark" (Canon, p. 91), but he does not include it in the "Synopsis of Historical Evidence," p. 584.

[4] . . . ταῦθ' οὗτοι καθάπερ προσδεομένῳ τῷ θεῷ λογιζόμενοι παρέχειν, μωρίαν εἰκὸς μᾶλλον ἡγοῖντ' ἂν, οὐ θεοσέβειαν. Ὁ γὰρ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν,

compared with Acts xvii. 24: "The God that made the world and all things in it, he being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; (25) neither is served by men's hand as though he needed anything, seeing he himself giveth to all life and breath and all things."[1] There is nothing here but a coincidence of sense, though with much variation between the two passages, but the Epistle argues from a different context, and this illustration is obvious enough to be common to any moralist. There is not a single reason which points to the Acts as the source of the writer's argument.

Basilides and Valentinus are not claimed at all by apologists as witnesses for the existence of the Acts of the Apostles, nor is Marcion, whose Canon, however, of which it formed no part, is rather adverse to the work than merely negative. Tertullian taunts Marcion for receiving Paul as an apostle, although his name is not mentioned in the Gospel, and yet not receiving the Acts of the Apostles in which alone his history is narrated;[2] but it does not in the least degree follow from this that Marcion knew the work and deliberately rejected it.

A passage of Tatian's oration to the Greeks is pointed out by some[3] as showing his acquaintance with the Acts. It is as follows: "I am not willing to worship the creation

καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν χορηγῶν ὧν προσδεόμεθα, οὐδενὸς ἂν αὐτὸς προσδέοιτο τούτων ὧν τοῖς οἰομένοις διδόναι παρέχει αὐτός. Ep. ad Diognetum, c. iii.

[1] Acts xvii. 24. *Ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, οὗτος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ὑπάρχων κύριος οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ, 25. οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων θεραπεύεται προσδεόμενός τινος, αὐτὸς διδοὺς πᾶσιν ζωὴν καὶ πνοὴν καὶ τὰ πάντα.*

[2] Adv. Marc., v. 1 ff.

[3] *Kirchhofer*, Quellens., p. 166; *Lardner* mentions, merely to disclaim, it. Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 139 f. Dr. Westcott does not advance it at all.

made by him for us. Sun and moon are made for us: how, therefore, shall I worship my own servants? How can I declare stocks and stones to be gods? . . . But neither should the unnameable (*ἀνωνόμαστον*) God be presented with bribes; for he who is without need of anything (*πάντων ἀνενδεὴς*) must not be calumniated by us as needy (*ἐνδεής*)."[1] This is compared with Acts xvii. 24, 25, quoted above, and it only serves to show how common such language was. Lardner himself says of the passage: "This is much the same thought, and applied to the same purpose, with Paul's, Acts xvii. 25, *as though he needeth anything.* But it is a character of the Deity so obvious, that I think it cannot determine us to suppose he had an eye to those words of the Apostle."[2] The language, indeed, is quite different and shows no acquaintance with the Acts.[3] Eusebius states that the Severians who more fully established Tatian's heresy rejected both the Epistles of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles.[4]

Dionysius of Corinth is scarcely adduced by any one as testimony for the Acts. The only ground upon which he is at all referred to is a statement of Eusebius in mentioning his Epistles. Speaking of his Epistle to the Athenians, Eusebius says: "He relates, moreover, that Dionysius the Areopagite who was converted to the faith by Paul the Apostle, according to the account given in the

[1] *Δημιουργίαν τὴν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγενημένην χάριν ἡμῶν προσκυνεῖν οὐ θέλω. Γέγονεν ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη δι' ἡμᾶς· εἶτα πῶς τοὺς ἐμοὺς ὑπηρέτας προσκυνήσω; Πῶς δὲ ξύλα καὶ λίθους θεοὺς ἀποφανοῦμαι; . . . Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸν ἀνωνόμαστον θεὸν δωροδοκητέον· ὁ γὰρ πάντων ἀνενδεὴς οὐ διαβλητέος ὑφ' ἡμῶν ὡς ἐνδεής.* Orat. ad Graecos, c. iv.

[2] Credibility, &c., Works, ii., p. 139 f.

[3] *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 76; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 337, anm. 2; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 1 f.

[4] *Eusebius*, H. E., iv. 29.

Acts, was appointed the first bishop of the church of the Athenians."[1] Even apologists admit that it is doubtful how far Dionysius referred to the Acts,[2] the mention of the book here being most obviously made by Eusebius himself.

Melito of Sardis is not appealed to by any writer in connection with our work, nor can Claudius Apollinaris be pressed into this service. Athenagoras is supposed by some to refer to the very same passage in Acts xvii. 24, 25, which we have discussed when dealing with the work of Tatian. Athenagoras says: "The Creator and Father of the universe is not in need of blood, nor of the steam of burnt sacrifices, nor of the fragrance of flowers and of incense, he himself being the perfect fragrance, inwardly and outwardly without need."[3] And further on: "And you kings indeed build palaces for yourselves; but the world is not made as being needed by God."[4] These passages occur in the course of a defence of Christians for not offering sacrifices, and both in language and context they are quite independent of the Acts of the Apostles.

In the Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, giving an account of the persecution against them, it is said that the victims were praying for those from whom they suffered cruelties: "like Stephen the perfect martyr:

[1] Δηλοῖ δ'ἐπὶ τούτοις, ὡς καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀρεοπαγίτης ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου προτραπεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν πίστιν κατὰ τὰ ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι δεδηλωμένα, πρῶτος τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις παροικίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐγκεχείριστο. H. E., iv. 23.

[2] *Lardner*, Credibility, &c., Works, ii. p. 134; *Kirchhofer*, Quellens., p. 163. Dr. Westcott naturally does not refer to the passage at all.

[3] Ὁ τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργὸς καὶ πατὴρ οὐ δεῖται αἵματος, οὐδὲ κνίσσης, οὐδὲ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθῶν καὶ θυμιαμάτων εὐωδίας, αὐτὸς ὢν ἡ τελεία εὐωδία, ἀνενδεὴς καὶ ἀπροσδεής· Leg. pro Christ., xiii.

[4] Καὶ ὑμεῖς μὲν οἱ βασιλεῖς ἑαυτοῖς ἀσκεῖτε τὰς καταγωγὰς βασιλικάς· ὁ δὲ κόσμος, οὐχ ὡς δεομένου τοῦ θεοῦ, γέγονεν. Leg. pro Christ., xvi.

'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.' But if he was supplicating for those who stoned him, how much more for the brethren?"[1] The prayer here quoted agrees with that ascribed to Stephen in Acts vii. 60. There is no mention of the Acts of the Apostles in the Epistle, and the source from which the writers obtained their information about Stephen is of course not stated. If there really was a martyr of the name of Stephen, and if these words were actually spoken by him, the tradition of the fact, and the memory of his noble saying, may well have remained in the Church, or have been recorded in writings then current, from one of which, indeed, eminent critics conjecture that the author of Acts derived his materials,[2] and in this case the passage obviously does not prove the use of the Acts. If, on the other hand, there never was such a martyr by whom these words were spoken, and the whole story must be considered an original invention by the author of Acts, then, in that case, and in that case only, the passage does show the use of the Acts.[3] Supposing that the use of Acts be held to be thus indicated, what does this prove? Merely that the Acts of the Apostles were in existence in the year 177-178, when the Epistle of

[1] . . . καθάπερ Στέφανος ὁ τέλειος μάρτυς· Κύριε, μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ταύτην. εἰ δ' ὑπὲρ τῶν λιθαζόντων ἐδέετο, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν; Eusebius, H. E., v. 2.

[2] *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 341 f., p. 347 f.; *Ewald*, Gesch. d. V. Isr. vi., 1858, p. 37, p. 191 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, 1838, i. p. 404, p. 409 f.; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 12; *Neander*, Pflanzung. u. s. w. chr. Kirche, 5te Aufl., p. 65, anm. 2; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen. d. Schr. des Lukas, 1847, i. p. 250 ff.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 249 f., &c., &c.

[3] Dr. Lightfoot, speaking of the passage we are discussing, says: "Will he (author of S. R.) boldly maintain that the writers had before them another Acts containing words identical with our Acts, just as he supposes, &c., &c. . . . Or will he allow this account to have been taken from Acts vii. 60, with which it coincides?" Contemp. Review, August, 1876, p. 410. The question is here answered.

Vienne and Lyons was written. No light whatever would thus be thrown upon the question of its authorship; and neither its credibility nor its sufficiency to prove the reality of a cycle of miracles would be in the slightest degree established.

Ptolemæus and Heracleon need not detain us, as it is not alleged that they show acquaintance with the Acts, nor is Celsus claimed as testimony for the book.

The Canon of Muratori contains a very corrupt paragraph regarding the Acts of the Apostles. We have already discussed the date and character of this fragment,[1] and need not further speak of it here. The sentence in which we are now interested reads in the original as follows:

"Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scribta sunt lucas obtime theofile conprindit quia sub præsentia eius singula gerebantur sicute et semote passionem petri euidenter declarat sed et profectionem pauli ab urbes ad spania proficescentis."

It is probable that in addition to its corruption some words may have been lost from the concluding phrase of this passage, but the following may perhaps sufficiently represent its general sense: "But the Acts of all the Apostles were written in one book. Luke included (in his work) to the excellent Theophilus only the things which occurred in his own presence, as he evidently shows by omitting the martyrdom of Peter and also the setting forth of Paul from the city to Spain."

Whilst this passage may prove the existence of the Acts about the end of the second century, and that the authorship of the work was ascribed to Luke, it has no further value. No weight can be attached to the statement of

[1] S. R., ii. p. 237 ff.

the unknown writer beyond that of merely testifying to the currency of such a tradition, and even the few words quoted show how uncritical he was. Nothing could be less appropriate to the work before us than the assertion that it contains the Acts of *all* the Apostles, for it must be apparent to all, and we shall hereafter have to refer to the point, that it very singularly omits all record of the acts of most of the apostles, occupies itself chiefly with those of Peter and Paul, and devotes considerable attention to Stephen and to others who were not apostles at all. We shall further have occasion to show that the writer does anything but confine himself to the events of which he was an eye-witness, and we may merely remark, in passing, as a matter which scarcely concerns us here, that the instances given by the unknown writer of the fragment to support his assertion are not only irrelevant, but singularly devoid themselves of historical attestation.

Irenæus[1] assigns the Acts of the Apostles to Luke, as do Clement of Alexandria,[2] Tertullian,[3] and Origen,[4] although without any statements giving special weight to their mention of him as the author in any way counterbalancing the late date of their testimony. Beyond showing that tradition, at the end of the second century and beginning of the third, associated the name of Luke with this writing and the third Gospel, the evidence of these Fathers is of no value to us. We have already incidentally mentioned that some heretics either ignored or rejected the book, and to the Marcionites and Severians

[1] Adv. Hær., iii. 14, § 1, 2; 15, § i., &c.
[2] Strom., v. 12; Adumbr. in 1 Petr. Ep.
[3] De Jejunio, x.
[4] Contra Cels., vi. 12.

we may now add the Ebionites[1] and Manichæans.[2] Chrysostom complains that in his day the Acts of the Apostles were so neglected that many were ignorant of the existence of the book and of its authors.[3] Doubts as to its authorship were expressed in the ninth century, for Photius states that some ascribed the work to Clement of Rome, others to Barnabas, and others to Luke the evangelist.[4]

If we turn to the document itself, we find that it professes to be the second portion of a work written for the information of an unknown person named Theophilus, the first part being the Gospel, which, in our canonical New Testament, bears the name of "Gospel according to Luke." The narrative is a continuation of the third Synoptic, but the actual title of "Acts of the Apostles," or "Acts of Apostles" (*πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων, πράξεις ἀποστόλων*),[5] attached to this δεύτερος λόγος is a later addition, and formed no part of the original document. The author's name is not given in any of the earlier MSS., and the work is entirely anonymous. That in the prologue to the Acts the writer clearly assumes to be the author of the Gospel does not in any way identify him, inasmuch as the third Synoptic itself is equally anonymous. The tradition assigning both works to Luke the follower of Paul, as we have seen, is first met with

[1] *Epiphanius*, Hær., xxx. 16.

[2] *August.* Epist. 237; ed. Bened., ii. p. 644; De Util. Cred., ii. 7, T. viii. p. 36; cf. *Beausobre*, Hist. de Manichée, i. p. 293 f.

[3] *Πολλοῖς τουτὶ τὸ βιβλίον οὐδ' ὅτι ἔνι γνώριμόν ἐστιν, οὔτε αὐτὸ, οὔτε ὁ γράψας αὐτὸ καὶ συνθείς.* Hom. i. in Act. Apost.

[4] *Τὸν δὲ συγγραφέα τῶν πράξεων οἱ μὲν Κλήμεντα λέγουσι τὸν Ῥώμης, ἄλλοι δὲ Βαρνάβαν, καὶ ἄλλοι Λουκᾶν τὸν εὐαγγελιστήν.* *Photius*, Amphiloch. Quæst. 145.

[5] The *Cod. Sin.* reads simply *πράξεις*. Cod. D. (Bezæ) has *πράξις ἀποστόλων*, "Acting of Apostles."

towards the end of the second century, and very little weight can be attached to it. There are too many instances of early writings, several of which indeed have secured a place in our canon, to which distinguished names have been erroneously ascribed. Such tradition is notoriously liable to error.

We shall presently return to the question of the authorship of the third Synoptic and Acts of the Apostles, but at present we may so far anticipate as to say that there are good reasons for affirming that they could not have been written by Luke.

Confining ourselves here to the actual evidence before us, we arrive at a clear and unavoidable conclusion regarding the Acts of the Apostles. After examining all the early Christian Literature, and taking every passage which is referred to as indicating the use of the book, we see that there is no certain trace even of its existence till towards the end of the second century; and, whilst the writing itself is anonymous, we find no authority but late tradition assigning it to Luke or to any other author. We are absolutely without evidence of any value as to its accuracy or trustworthiness, and, as we shall presently see, the epistles of Paul, so far from accrediting it, tend to cast the most serious doubt upon its whole character. This evidence we have yet to examine, when considering the contents of the Acts, and we base our present remarks solely on the external testimony for the date and authorship of the book. Our position, therefore, is simply this: We are asked to believe in the reality of a great number of miraculous and supernatural occurrences which, obviously, are antecedently incredible, upon the assurance of an anonymous work of whose existence there is no distinct evidence till more than a century

after the events narrated, and to which an author's name—against which there are strong objections—is first ascribed by tradition towards the end of the second century. Of the writer to whom the work is thus attributed we know nothing beyond the casual mention of his name in some Pauline Epistles. If it were admitted that this Luke did actually write the book, we should not be justified in believing the reality of such stupendous miracles upon his bare statement. As the case stands, however, even taking it in its most favourable aspect, the question scarcely demands serious attention, and our discussion might at once be ended by the unhesitating rejection of the Acts of the Apostles as sufficient, or even plausible, evidence for the miracles which it narrates.

CHAPTER II.

EVIDENCE REGARDING THE AUTHORSHIP.

If we proceed further to discuss the document before us, it is from no doubt as to the certainty of the conclusion at which we have now arrived, but from the belief that closer examination of the contents of the Acts may enable us to test this result, and more fully to understand the nature of the work and the character of its evidence. Not only will it be instructive to consider a little closely the contents of the Acts, and to endeavour from the details of the narrative itself to form a judgment regarding its historical value, but we have in addition external testimony of very material importance which we may bring to bear upon it. We happily possess some undoubted Epistles which afford us no little information concerning the history, character, and teaching of the Apostle Paul, and we are thus enabled to compare the statements in the work before us with contemporary evidence of great value. It is scarcely necessary to say that, wherever the statements of the unknown author of the Acts are at variance with these Epistles, we must prefer the statements of the Apostle. The importance to our inquiry of such further examination as we now propose to undertake consists chiefly in the light which it may throw on the credibility of the work. If it be found that such

portions as we are able to investigate are inaccurate and untrustworthy, it will become still more apparent that the evidence of such a document for miracles, which are antecedently incredible, cannot even be entertained. It may be well also to discuss more fully the authorship of the Acts, and to this we shall first address ourselves.

It must, however, be borne in mind that it is quite foreign to our purpose to enter into any exhaustive discussion of the literary problem presented by the Acts of the Apostles. We shall confine ourselves to such points as seem sufficient or best fitted to test the character of the composition, and we shall not hesitate to pass without attention questions of mere literary interest, and strictly limit our examination to such prominent features as present themselves for our purpose.

It is generally admitted, although not altogether without exception,[1] that the author of our third Synoptic Gospel likewise composed the Acts of the Apostles. The linguistic and other peculiarities which distinguish the Gospel are equally prominent in the Acts. This fact, whilst apparently offering greatly increased facilities for identifying the author, and actually affording valuable material for estimating his work, does not, as we have already remarked, really do much towards solving the problem of the authorship, inasmuch as the Gospel, like its continuation, is anonymous, and we possess no more precise or direct evidence in connection with the one than in the case of the other. We have already so fully examined the testimony for the third Gospel that it is unnecessary for us to recur to it. From about the end of the second century we find the Gospel and Acts of the

[1] *Scholten*, Is de derde Evangelist de Schrijver van het Boek der Handelingen? 1873; *Wittichen*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theologie, 1873, p. 508 ff.

Apostles ascribed by ecclesiastical writers to Luke, the companion of the Apostle Paul. The fallibility of tradition, and the singular phase of literary morality exhibited during the early ages of Christianity, render such testimony of little or no value, and in the almost total absence of the critical faculty a rank crop of pseudonymic writings sprang up and flourished during that period.[1] Some of the earlier chapters of this work have given abundant illustrations of this fact. It is absolutely certain, with regard to the works we are considering, that Irenæus is the earliest writer known who ascribes them to Luke, and that even tradition, therefore, cannot be traced beyond the last quarter of the second century. The question is—does internal evidence confirm or contradict this tradition?

Luke, the traditional author, is not mentioned by name in the Acts of the Apostles.[2] In the Epistle to Philemon his name occurs, with those of others, who send greeting, verse 23, "There salute thee Epaphras, my fellow prisoner in Christ Jesus; 24. Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, my fellow-labourers." In the Epistle to the Colossians, iv. 14, mention is also made of him:—"Luke, the beloved physician,[3] salutes you, and Demas." And again, in the 2 Epistle to Timothy, iv. 10:—"For

[1] Cf. *Köstlin*, Theol. Jahrbücher, 1851, p. 149 ff.

[2] It is unnecessary to discuss the ingeniously far-fetched theory which has been advanced by a few critics to show the identity of Luke with the Silas (or Silvanus) of the Acts, based upon the analogy presented by their names: *lucus* a grove, *silva* a wood. Nor need we amuse the reader with *Lange's* suggestion that Luke may be the Aristion mentioned by Papias, from ἀριστεύειν=lucere.

[3] Calvin, Basnage, Heumann and others have doubted whether this Luke is the same as the Luke elsewhere mentioned without this distinguishing expression, and whether he was the Evangelist. The point need not detain us. Cf. *Lardner*, Credibility, Works, vi. p. 116 f. 118.

Demas forsook me, having loved this present world, and departed into Thessalonica, Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia: 11. Only Luke is with me."

He is not mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament;[1] and his name is not again met with till Irenæus ascribes to him the authorship of the Gospel and Acts. There is nothing in these Pauline Epistles confirming the statement of the Fathers, but it is highly probable that these references to him largely contributed to suggest his name as the author of the Acts, the very omission of his name from the work protecting him from objections connected with the passages in the first person to which other followers of Paul were exposed, upon the traditional view of the composition. Irenæus evidently knew nothing about him, except what he learnt from these Epistles, and derives from his theory that Luke wrote the Acts, and speaks as an eye-witness in the passages where the first person is used. From these he argues that Luke was inseparable from Paul, and was his fellow-worker in the Gospel, and he refers, in proof of this, to Acts xvi. 8 ff.,[2] 13 ff., xx. 5 ff., and the later chapters, all the details of which he supposes Luke to have carefully written down. He then continues: "But that he was not only a follower, but likewise a fellow-worker of the Apostles, but particularly of Paul, Paul himself has also clearly shown in the Epistles, saying: . . . " and he quotes 2 Tim. iv. 10, 11, ending: "Only Luke is with me," and then adds, "whence he shows that he was

[1] It is now universally admitted that the "Lucius" referred to in Acts. xiii. 1 and Rom. xvi. 21 is a different person; although their identity was suggested by Origen and the Alexandrian Clement.

[2] The words "they came down to Troas" (*κατέβησαν εἰς Τρωάδα*) are here translated "we came to Troas" (nos venimus in Troadem).

always with him and inseparable from him, &c., &c."[1] The reasoning of the zealous Father deduces a great deal from very little, it will be observed, and in this elastic way tradition "enlarged its borders" and assumed unsubstantial dimensions. Later writers have no more intimate knowledge of Luke, although Eusebius states that he was born at Antioch,[2] a tradition likewise reproduced by Jerome.[3] Jerome further identifies Luke with "the brother, whose praise in the Gospel is throughout all the churches" mentioned in 2 Cor. viii. 18, as accompanying Titus to Corinth.[4] At a later period, when the Church required an early artist for its service, Luke the physician was honoured with the additional title of painter.[5] Epiphanius,[6] followed later by some other

[1] Quoniam non solum prosecutor, sed et cooperarius fuerit apostolorum, maxime autem Pauli, et ipse autem Paulus manifestavit in epistolis, dicens: 'Demas me dereliquit, et abiit Thessalonicam, Crescens in Galatiam, Titus in Dalmatiam. Lucas est mecum solus.' Unde ostendit, quod semper junctus ei et inseparabilis fuerit ab eo. Adv. Hær., iii. 14 § 1.

[2] H. E., iii. 4.

[3] De vir. ill. 7.

[4] l. c. This view was held by Origen, Ambrose, and others of the Fathers; who, moreover, suppose Paul to refer to the work of Luke when he speaks of "his Gospel" (also cf. *Eusebius*, H. E., iii. 4), an opinion exploded by Grotius. Grotius and Olshausen both identify "the brother" with Luke. Many of the Fathers and later writers have variously conjectured him to have been Barnabas, Silas, Mark, Trophimus, Gaius, and others. This is mere guess-work; but Luke is scarcely seriously advanced in later times. The Bishop of Lincoln, however, not only does so, but maintains that Paul quotes Luke's Gospel in his Epistles, in one place (1 Tim. v. 18) designating it as *Scripture*. Greek Test., Four Gospels, p. 163, p. 170.

[5] *Nicephorus*, H. E., ii. 43. The Bishop of Lincoln, who speaks of "this divine book," the Acts of the Apostles, with great enthusiasm, says in one place: "The Acts of the Apostles is a portraiture of the church; it is an Historical Picture delineated by the Holy Ghost guiding the hand of the Evangelical Painter St. Luke." Greek Test., Int. to Acts, 1874, p. 4.

[6] Hær., li. 11; Theophylact (ad Luc. xxiv. 18) suggests the view—con-

writers, represented him to have been one of the seventy-two disciples, whose mission he alone of all New Testament writers mentions. The view of the Fathers, arising out of the application of their tradition to the features presented by the Gospel and Acts, was that Luke composed his Gospel, of the events of which he was not an eye-witness, from information derived from others, and his Acts of the Apostles from what he himself, at least in the parts in which the first person is employed, had witnessed.[1] It is generally supposed that Luke was not born a Jew, but was a Gentile Christian.

Some writers endeavour to find a confirmation of the tradition, that the Gospel and Acts were written by Luke "the beloved physician," by the supposed use of peculiarly technical medical terms,[2] but very little weight is attached by any one to this feeble evidence which is repudiated by most serious critics, and it need not detain us.

As there is no indication, either in the Gospel or the Acts, of the author's identity proceeding from himself, and tradition does not offer any alternative security, what testimony can be produced in support of the ascription of

sidered probable by *Lange*, Leben Jesu, i. p. 252—that Luke was one of the two disciples of the journey to Emmaus. This is the way in which tradition works.

[1] Cf. *Eusebius*, H. E., iii. 4; *Hieron.*, de vir. ill. 7. We need not discuss the view which attributes to Luke the translation or authorship of the Ep. to the Hebrews.

[2] Cf. Luke iv. 38, viii. 43, 44, xxii. 44; Acts iii. 7, xii. 23, xiii. 11, xxviii. 8, &c., &c. *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. d. evang. Gesch., 1850, p. 683; *Hackett*, On Acts, 1852, p. 5, p. 385; *Humphrey*, On Acts, 1854, p. xiv.; *Meyer*, Kr. ex. H'buch üb. d. Ev. des Markus u. Lukas, 5te Aufl., p. 327; Apostelgesch., p. 562; *Alford*, Greek Test., 1871, ii. proleg. p. 3 § 10; *J. Smith*, Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, 3 ed., 1866, p. 2 f.; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test., Four Gospels, p. 160. Cf. *Hug*, Einl. N. T., 4te Aufl., p. 126, anm. 1.

these writings to "Luke?" To this question Ewald shall reply: "In fact," he says, "we possess only one ground for it, but this is fully sufficient. It lies in the designation of the third Gospel as that 'according to Luke' which is found in all MSS. of the four Gospels. For the quotations of this particular Gospel under the distinct name of Luke, in the extant writings of the Fathers, begin so late that they cannot be compared in antiquity with that superscription; and those known to us may probably themselves only go back to this superscription. We thus depend almost alone on this superscription."[1] Ewald generally does consider his own arbitrary conjectures "fully sufficient," but it is doubtful, whether in this case, any one who examines this evidence will agree with him. He himself goes on to admit, with all other critics, that the superscriptions to our Gospels do not proceed from the authors themselves, but were added by those who collected them, or by later readers to distinguish them.[2] There was no author's name attached to Marcion's Gospel, as we learn from Tertullian.[3] Chrysostom very distinctly asserts that the Evangelists did not inscribe their names at the head of their works,[4] and he recognizes that, but for the authority of the primitive Church which added those names, the superscriptions could not have proved the authorship of the Gospels. He conjectures that the sole superscription which may

[1] *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., 1857, 1858, ix. p. 55.

[2] *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ix. p. 56 f.; *Bertholdt*, Einl. A. u. N. Test., 1813, iii. p. 1095; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 89; *Guericke*, Gesammtgesch. N. T., p. 107 f., anm. 2; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., 1875, p. 779; *Hug*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 222 f.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T. 4te Aufl., p. 391 f.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 47 f., &c., &c.

[3] Adv. Marc. iv. 2.

[4] Hom. i. in Epist. ad. Rom.

have been placed by the author of the first Synoptic was simply *εὐαγγέλιον*.[1] It might be argued, and indeed has been, that the inscription *κατὰ Λουκᾶν*, "according to Luke," instead of *εὐαγγέλιον Λουκᾶ* "Gospel of Luke," does not actually indicate that "Luke" wrote the work any more than the superscription to the Gospels "according to the Hebrews" (*καθ' Ἑβραίους*) "according to the Egyptians" (*κατ' Αἰγυπτίους*) has reference to authorship. The Epistles, on the contrary, are directly connected with their writers, in the genitive, *Παύλου*, *Πέτρου*, and so on. This point, however, we merely mention *en passant*. By his own admission, therefore, the superscription is merely tradition in another form, but instead of carrying us further back, the superscription on the most ancient extant MSS., as for instance the Sinaitic and Vatican Codices of the Gospels, does not on the most sanguine estimate of their age, date earlier than the fourth century.[2] As for the Acts of the Apostles, the book is not ascribed to Luke in a single uncial MS., and it only begins to appear in various forms in later codices. The variation in the titles of the Gospels and Acts in different MSS. alone shows the uncertainty of the superscription. It is clear that the "one ground" upon which Ewald admits that the evidence for Luke's authorship is based, is nothing but sand, and cannot support his tower. He is on the slightest consideration thrown back upon the quotations of the Fathers, which begin too late for the

[1] Hom. i. in Matth. præp. *Grotius* considers that the ancient heading was *εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, as in some MSS. of our second Synoptic. Annot. in N. T., i. p. 7. So also *Bertholdt*, Einl., iii. p. 1095, and others.

[2] *Tischendorf*, N. T. Gr. ed. oct. Crit. Maior, 1869, i. p. ix. ff.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 76 ff.; *Hug*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 234 ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 394 ff.; *Reithmayr*, Einl. N. B., 1852, p. 227 ff.; *Alford*, Greek Test., i. Proleg., p. 107 ff.; ii. Proleg., p. 62 ff.; *Scrivener*, Int. to Criticism of N. T., 1874, p. 83 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 790 ff.

purpose, and it must be acknowledged that the ascription of the third Gospel and Acts to Luke rests solely upon late and unsupported tradition.

Let it be remembered that with the exception of the three passages in the Pauline Epistles quoted above, we know absolutely nothing about Luke. As we have mentioned, it has even been doubted whether the designation "the beloved physician" in the Epistle to the Colossians, iv. 14, does not distinguish a different Luke from the person of that name in the Epistles to Philemon and Timothy. If this were the case, our information would be further reduced; but supposing that the same Luke is referred to, what does our information amount to? Absolutely nothing but the fact that a person named Luke was represented by the writer of these letters,[1] whoever he was, to have been with Paul in Rome, and that he was known to the church of Colossæ. There is no evidence whatever that this Luke had been a travelling companion of Paul, or that he ever wrote a line concerning him or had composed a Gospel. He is not mentioned in Epistles written during this journey, and indeed, the rarity and meagreness of the references to him would much rather indicate that he had not taken any distinguished part in the proclamation of the Gospel. If Luke be ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, and be numbered amongst the Apostle's συνεργοί, Tychicus is equally "the beloved brother and faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord."[2] Onesimus the "faithful and beloved brother,"[3]

[1] We cannot discuss the authenticity of these Epistles in this place, nor is it very important that we should do so. Nor can we pause to consider whether they were written in Rome, as a majority of critics think, or elsewhere.

[2] ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος καὶ σύνδουλος ἐν Κυρίῳ. Coloss. iv. 7.

[3] Coloss. iv. 9.

and Aristarchus, Mark the cousin of Barnabas, Justus and others are likewise his *συνεργοί*.[1] There is no evidence, in fact, that Paul was acquainted with Luke earlier than during his imprisonment in Rome, and he seems markedly excluded from the Apostle's work and company by such passages as 2 Cor. i. 19.[2] The simple theory that Luke wrote the Acts supplies all the rest of the tradition of the Fathers, as we have seen in the case of Irenæus, and to this mere tradition we are confined in the total absence of more ancient testimony.

The traditional view, which long continued to prevail undisturbed, and has been widely held up to our own day,[3] represents Luke as the author of the Acts, and, in

[1] Coloss. iv. 10, 11; Philem. 23, 24.

[2] *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., i. 81, an. 2.

[3] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 1 f.; *Baumgarten*, Die Apostelgeschichte, 2te Aufl., i. p. 495 ff.; *Beelen*, Acta Apost., ed. alt., p. 4, p. 401 ann. 1; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 130, p. 280 ff.; Das N. T., 1847, ii. p. 355; *von Döllinger*, Christenthum u. Kirche, 2te Aufl., p. 134 f.; *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. evang. Gesch., p. 732 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 10 ff., p. 30 ff.; *Ewald*, Gesch. d. Volkes Isr., vi. p. 33 ff.; Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ix. p. 50 ff.; *Feilmoser*, Einl. N. B., p. 296 ff.; *Grau*, Entw. N. T., Schriftthums, 1871, i. p. 316 f.; *Guericke*, Beiträge N. T., 1828, p. 74 ff.; Gesammtgesch. N. T., p. 279 f.; *Hackett*, On the Acts, 1852, p. 5 f.; *Heinrichs*, N. T. gr., iii. p. 29 f.; *Humphrey*, On Acts, p. xiii. f.; *Hug*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 127 f., p. 257 ff.; *Kuinoel*, Comm. in N. T., iv. p. xv.; *Klostermann*, Vindiciæ Lucanæ, 1866, p. 68 ff.; *Lange*, Apost. Zeit., 1853, i. p. 90 f.; *Lekebusch*, Die Comp. u. Entst. der Apostelgesch., 1854, p. 7 ff., p. 131 ff., p. 387 ff.; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 4 ff.; *Michaelis*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 1175 ff.; *Oertel*, Paulus in der Apostelgesch., 1868, p. 7 ff., p. 27 ff.; *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm., ii. 3 Apostelgesch., 1862, p. 8, p. 225 f.; *de Pressensé*, Hist. des trois prem. siècles de l'Église, 2me éd., i. p. 485; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xiv. ff., St. Paul, 1869, p. 130 f., n. 3; *Riehm*, De fontibus Act. Apost., 1821, p. 62 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Zweck der Apostelgesch., 1841, p. 17 ff.; *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 137; Versuch Herstell. Kr. N. T., p. 209 ff.; *Trip*, Paulus nach d. Apostelgesch., 1866, p. 30 ff., p. 272 f.; *Tholuck*, Glaubwürdigk. ev. Gesch. 2te Aufl., p. 375 ff.; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test., The Four Gospels, p. 168 f., Acts, p. 118; *Wieseler*, Chron. d. Apost. Zeit., p. 36 ff., et passim. Cf. *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., 5te Aufl., p. 1 ff., p. 229.

the passages where the first person is employed, considers that he indicates himself as an actor and eye-witness. These passages, where ἡμεῖς is introduced, present a curious problem which has largely occupied the attention of critics, and it has been the point most firmly disputed in the long controversy regarding the authorship of the Acts. Into this literary labyrinth we must not be tempted to enter beyond a very short way; for, however interesting the question may be in itself, we are left so completely to conjecture that no result is possible which can materially affect our inquiry, and we shall only refer to it sufficiently to illustrate the uncertainty which prevails regarding the authorship. We shall, however, supply abundant references for those who care more minutely to pursue the subject.

After the narrative of the Acts has, through fifteen chapters, proceeded uninterruptedly in the third person, an abrupt change to the first person plural occurs in the sixteenth chapter.[1] Paul, and at least Timothy, are represented as going through Phrygia and Galatia, and at length "they came down to Troas," where a vision appears to Paul beseeching him to come over into Macedonia. Then, xvi. 10, proceeds: "And after he saw the vision, immediately we endeavoured (ἐζητήσαμεν) to go forth into Macedonia, concluding that God had called us (ἡμᾶς) to preach the Gospel unto them." After verse 17, the direct form of narrative is as suddenly dropped as it was taken up, and does not reappear until xx. 5, when, without explanation, it is resumed and continued for ten verses. It is then again abandoned, and recommenced in xxi. 1-18, and xxvii. 1, xxviii. 16.

[1] It is unnecessary to discuss whether xiv. 22 belongs to the ἡμεῖς sections or not.

It is argued by those who adopt the traditional view,[1] that it would be an instance of unparalleled negligence, in so careful a writer as the author of the third Synoptic and Acts, to have composed these sections from documents lying before him, written by others, leaving them in the form of a narrative in the first person, whilst the rest of his work was written in the third, and that, without doubt, he would have assimilated such portions to the form of the rest. On the other hand, that he himself makes distinct use of the first person in Luke i. 1-3 and Acts i. 1, and consequently prepares the reader to expect that, where it is desirable, he will resume the direct mode of communication; and in support of this supposition, it is asserted that the very same peculiarities of style and language exist in the ἡμεῖς passages as in the rest of the work. The adoption of the direct form of narrative in short merely indicates that the author himself was present and an eye-witness of what he relates,[2] and that writing as he did for the information of Theophilus, who was well aware of his personal participation in the journeys he records, it was not necessary for him to give any explanation of his occasional use of the first person.

Is the abrupt and singular introduction of the first person in these particular sections of his work, without a word of explanation, more intelligible and reasonable upon the traditional theory of their being by the author himself as an eye-witness? On the contrary, it is maintained, the phenomenon on that hypothesis becomes much more

[1] See references in note 3, p. 40.

[2] Some writers also consider as one of the reasons why Luke, the supposed author, uses the first person, that where he begins to do so he himself becomes associated with Paul in his work, and first begins to preach the Gospel. *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 137; *Baumgarten*, Die Apostelgeschichte, i. p. 496.

inexplicable. On examining the ἡμεῖς sections it will be observed that they consist almost entirely of an itinerary of journeys, and that while the chronology of the rest of the Acts is notably uncertain and indefinite, these passages enter into the minutest details of daily movements (xvi. 11, 12; xx. 6, 7, 11, 15; xxi. 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 18; xxvii. 2; xxviii. 7, 12, 14) of the route pursued, and places through which often they merely pass (xvi. 11, 12; xx. 5, 6, 13, 15; xxi. 1-3, 7; xxvii. 2 ff.; xxviii. 11-15), and record the most trifling circumstances (xvi. 12; xx. 13; xxi. 2, 3, 15; xxviii. 2, 11). The distinguishing feature of these sections in fact is generally asserted to be the stamp which they bear, above all other parts of the Acts, of intimate personal knowledge of the circumstances related.

Is it not, however, exceedingly remarkable that the author of the Acts should intrude his own personality merely to record these minute details of voyages and journeys? That his appearance as an eye-witness should be almost wholly limited to the itinerary of Paul's journeys and to portions of his history which are of very subordinate interest? The voyage and shipwreck are thus narrated with singular minuteness of detail, but if any one who reads it only consider the matter for a moment, it will become apparent that this elaboration of the narrative is altogether disproportionate to the importance of the voyage in the history of the early Church. The traditional view indeed is fatal to the claims of the Acts as testimony for the great mass of miracles it contains, for the author is only an eye-witness of what is comparatively unimportant and commonplace. The writer's intimate acquaintance with the history of Paul, and his claim to participation in his work, begin and end with his actual

journeys. With very few exceptions, as soon as the Apostle stops anywhere, he ceases to speak as an eye-witness and relapses into vagueness and the third person. At the very time when minuteness of detail would have been most interesting, he ceases to be minute. A very long and important period of Paul's life is covered by the narrative between xvi. 10, where the ἡμεῖς sections begin, and xxviii. 16, where they end; but, although the author goes with such extraordinary detail into the journeys to which they are confined, how bare and unsatisfactory is the account of the rest of Paul's career during that time![1] How eventful that career must have been we learn from 2 Cor. xi. 23-26. In any case, the author who could be so minute in his record of an itinerary, apparently could not, or would not, be minute in his account of more important matters in his history. In the few verses, ix. 1-30, chiefly occupied by an account of Paul's conversion, is comprised all that the author has to tell of three years of the Apostle's life, and into xi. 19—xiv. are compressed the events of fourteen years of his history (cf. Gal. ii. 1).[2] If the author of those portions be the same writer who is so minute in his daily itinerary in the ἡμεῖς sections, his sins of omission and commission are of a very startling character. To say nothing more severe here, upon the traditional theory he is an elaborate trifler.

Does the use of the first person in Luke i. 1-3 and Acts i. 1 in any way justify or prepare[3] the way for the

[1] Cf. *Ewald*, Gesch. v. Isr., vi. p. 35 f.

[2] Cf. *Overbeck*, zu de Wette's Kurze Erkl. Apostelgesch., 1870., Einl., p. lxi. f.

[3] Cf. *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ix. p. 51 ff.; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., 1870, p. 6; *Grau*, Entwicklungsgesch. des N. T. Schriftthums, 1871, i. p. 318; *Klostermann*, Vind. Lucanæ, 1866, p. 68 f.; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 2.

sudden and unexplained introduction of the first person in the sixteenth chapter? Certainly not. The ἐγώ in these passages is used solely in the personal address to Theophilus, is limited to the brief explanation contained in what may be called the dedication or preface, and is at once dropped when the history begins. If the prologue of the Gospel be applied to the Acts, moreover, the use of earlier documents is at once implied, which would rather justify the supposition that these passages are part of some diary, from which the general editor made extracts.[1] Besides, there is no explanation in the Acts which in the slightest degree connects the ἐγώ with the ἡμεῖς.[2] To argue that explanation was unnecessary, as Theophilus and early readers were well acquainted with the fact that the author was a fellow-traveller with the Apostle, and therefore at once understood the meaning of "We,"[3] would destroy the utility of the direct form of communication altogether; for if Theophilus knew this, there was obviously no need to introduce the first person at all, in so abrupt and singular a way, more especially to chronicle minute details of journeys which possess comparatively little interest. Moreover, writing for Theophilus, we might reasonably expect that he should have stated where and when he became associated with Paul, and explained the reasons why he again left and rejoined him.[4] Ewald suggests that possibly the author intended to have indicated his name more distinctly at the end of his work;[5] but this merely shows that, argue as he will,

[1] Cf. *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 4.

[2] *Overbeck*, Zu de Wette, Apostelgesch., p. xliii.

[3] *Lange*, Das apost. Zeitalter, 1853, i. p. 91; *Ewald*, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vi. p. 33 f.; Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ix. p. 51 f.; *Schneckenburger*, Ueb. d. Zweck d. Apostelgesch., 1841, p. 39; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 357.

[4] *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 331 f.

[5] Gesch. d. V. Isr., vi. p. 34, an. 1; Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ix. p. 52.

he feels the necessity for such an explanation. The conjecture is negatived, however, by the fact that no name is subsequently added. As in the case of the fourth Gospel, of course the "incomparable modesty" theory is suggested as the reason why the author does not mention his own name, and explain the adoption of the first person in the ἡμεῖς passages;[1] but to base theories such as this upon the modesty or elevated views of a perfectly unknown writer is obviously too arbitrary a proceeding to be permissible.[2] There is, besides, exceedingly little modesty in a writer forcing himself so unnecessarily into notice, for he does not represent himself as taking any active part in the events narrated; and, as the mere chronicler of days of sailing and arriving, he might well have remained impersonal to the end.

On the other hand, supposing the general editor of the Acts to have made use of written sources of information, and amongst others of the diary of a companion of the Apostle Paul, it is not equally strange that, for one reason or another, he should have allowed the original direct form of communication to stand whilst incorporating parts of it with his work. Instances have been pointed out in which a similar retention of the first or third person, in a narrative generally written otherwise, is accepted as the indication of a different written source, as for instance in Ezra vii. 27—ix; Nehemiah viii.—x.; in the Book of Tobit i. 1-3, iii. 7 ff., and other places;[3] and Schwanbeck has

[1] Cf. *Irenæus*, Adv. Hær., iii. 14, § 1; *Lange*, Das apost. Zeit., i. p. 91; *Ewald*, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vi. p. 33 ff.; Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ix. p. 52; *Olshausen*, Die Apostelgesch., 1862, p. 225; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test. Acts, p. 118.

[2] Cf. *Schwanbeck*, Ueber die Quellen d. Schr. d. Lukas, 1847, i. p. 128 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette's Apostelgesch., p. xliii.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 81, an. 2; *Meyer*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 357.

[3] *Ewald*, Gesch. d. V. Isr., 1864, i. p. 278; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 607.

pointed out many instances of a similar kind amongst the chroniclers of the middle ages.[1] There are various ways in which the retention of the first person in these sections, supposing them to have been derived from some other written source, might be explained. The simple supposition that the author, either through carelessness or oversight, allowed the ἡμεῖς to stand[2] is not excluded, and indeed some critics, although we think without reason, maintain both the third Gospel and the Acts to be composed of materials derived from various sources and put together with little care or adjustment.[3] The author might also have inserted these fragments of the diary of a fellow-traveller of Paul, and retained the original form of the document to strengthen the apparent credibility of his own narrative; or, as many critics believe, he may have allowed the first person of the original document to remain, in order himself to assume the character of eye-witness, and of companion of the Apostle.[4] As we shall see in the course of our examination of the Acts, the general procedure of the author is by no means of a character to discredit such an explanation.

We shall not enter into any discussion of the sources from which critics maintain that the author compiled his

[1] Quellen d. Schr. des Lukas, i. p. 188 ff. Cf. *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 247, an. e; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 332 anm.

[2] Cf. *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 331, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1047; *Scholten*, Het paulin. Evangelie, p. 451 f.

[3] *Schleiermacher*, Versuch üb. die Schr. des Lukas, Sämmtl. Werke, 1836, ii. p. 14 ff., p. 219 ff.; Einl. N. T., 1845 (iii.), p. 349 ff.; *Konigsmann*, Prolusio de fontibus Act. Apost., in Pott's Sylloge, 1802, iii. p. 215 ff.; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen Schr. d. Lukas, 1847, i. p. 41 ff., p. 253 ff.; *Scholten*, Het paulin. Evangelie, 1870, p. 451 f.

[4] *Baur*, Paulus, 2te Aufl., i. p. 16 f.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 456 f., p. 516, anm. 1; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, 1836, v. p. 549; *Stap*, Origines du Christianisme, 2me éd., p. 205 f.; *Overbeck*, Zu de Wette's Apostelgesch., 4te Aufl., p. xlv. f.; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitgesch., 1874, iii. p. 442, anm. 7.

work. It is sufficient to say that, whilst some profess to find definite traces of many documents, few if any writers deny that the writer made more or less use of earlier materials. It is quite true that the characteristics of the general author's style are found throughout the whole work.[1] The Acts are no mere aggregate of scraps collected and rudely joined together, but the work of one author in the sense that whatever materials he may have used for its composition were carefully assimilated, and subjected to thorough and systematic revision to adapt them to his purpose.[2] But however completely this process was carried out, and his materials interpenetrated by his own peculiarities of style and language, he did not succeed in entirely obliterating the traces of independent written sources. Some writers maintain that there is a very apparent difference between the first twelve chap-

[1] *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. 1. p. 132 ff., p. 282 f.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 387 ff., 457, 490 ff.; *Lekebusch*, Apostelgesch., p. 35 ff., 130 f.; *Oertel*, Paulus im Apostelg., p. 27 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 260 ff.; *Gersdorf*, Beiträge, p. 160 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 30 ff.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schriften, p. 20 ff., 218 ff.; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 341 ff., anm. 6; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 246 f.; Apostelgesch., p. xxxviii.; *Overbeck*, Zu de Wette's Apostelgesch., p. lvi. f.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 199 f.; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 3 f.; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 2 f.; *Trip*, Paulus nach d. Apostelg., p. 26 ff.; *Volkmar*, Das Ev. Marcions, p. 236, anm. 1.

[2] *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 340 f.; Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1034 f.; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 9 f.; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 280 ff., 132 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 260 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 35 ff.; *Gersdorf*, Beiträge, p. 160 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 574 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelwerk, viii., p. 349; *Lekebusch*, Apostelgesch., p. 35 ff., 130 ff.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schriften, p. 1 ff., 218 ff.; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 3 f., 12 f.; *Oertel*, Paulus in d. Apostelgesch., p. 24 ff.; *Olshausen*, Apostelgesch., p. 7 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette's Apostelgesch., p. lvii. ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, 1873, p. 497 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xi. ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 199 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Apostelgesch., p. 20 ff., 64 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 38 ff. 73 ff.; *Trip*, Paulus n. Apostelgesch., 1866, p. 26 f.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 246; Apostelgesch., p. xxxviii.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 387 ff. Cf. *Ewald*, Gesh. V. Isr., vi., p. 37 f.

ters and the remainder of the work, and profess to detect a much more Hebraistic character in the language of the earlier portion,[1] although this is not received without demur.[2] As regards the ἡμεῖς sections, whilst it is admitted that these fragments have in any case been much manipulated by the general editor, and largely contain his general characteristics of language, it is at the same time affirmed that they present distinct foreign peculiarities, which betray a borrowed document.[3] Even critics who maintain the ἡμεῖς sections to be by the same writer who composed the rest of the book point out the peculiarly natural character and minute knowledge displayed in these passages, as distinguishing them from the rest of the Acts.[4] This of course they attribute to the fact that the author there relates his personal experiences; but even with this explanation it is apparent that all who maintain the traditional view do recognize peculiarities in these sections, by which they justify the ascription of them to an eye-witness. For the reasons which have been very briefly indicated, therefore, and upon other

[1] *Ewald*, Gesch. d. V. Isr., vi. p. 37 f.; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 12; *Riehm*, De fontibus Act. Ap., p. 106 ff., 189 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Apostelgesch., p. 153 ff.; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen d. Schr. Lukas, i. p. 36 ff., 114 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 99; *Tholuck*, Glaubw. ev. Geschichte, p. 376 f.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 249 f. Cf. *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 282 f.; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., p. 12; *Lekebusch*, Apostelgesch., p. 404 f.

[2] *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 490 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette's Apostelg., p. lvi. f.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 31 ff. Cf. *Credner*, Einl., p. 282 f.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 35 ff., 404 f.

[3] *Zeller*, Apg., p. 457 f., 513 ff., 516, anm. 1; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. xxxix. f., xlv. f., l. anm.; *Straatman*, Paulus, de Apost. van Jezus Christus, 1874, p. 307 ff.; *Stap*, Origines du Christ., p. 205 f.; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitgesch., iii. p. 423 anm.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 246 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 607 f.; *Köstlin*, Urspr. Synopt. Evv., p. 291 f.

[4] *Lekebusch*, Apostelgesch., p. 382 ff., et passim; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 39, anm. 1; &c., &c.

strong grounds, some of which will be presently stated, a very large mass of the ablest critics have concluded that the ἡμεῖς sections were not composed by the author of the rest of the Acts, but that they are part of the diary of some companion of the Apostle Paul, of which the Author of Acts made use for his work,[1] and that the general writer of the work, and consequently of the third Synoptic, was not Luke at all.[2]

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, 2te Aufl., i. p. 16 f., p. 243; *Beyschlag*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1864, p. 214 f.; *Bertholdt*, Einl. N. T., iii. p. 1332; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 332 ff.; Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1030 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 273 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, ii. 245 f., i. p. 383 ff., 422 ff.; Allg. K. G., i. p. 165 f., 237; *Hauber*, Betracht. üb. einig. Glaubigen, u. s. w., chr. Kirche, p. 61 f.; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitgesch., iii. p. 422 f., anm. 7; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 606 ff., Die Evangelien, p. 225; *Holtzmann*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1873, p. 85 ff.; *Horst*, Essai sur les Sources de la deuxième partie des Actes des Apôtres, 1848; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 81, anm. 1; *Kohlreif*, Chronologia Sacra, p. 99 f.; *Köstlin*, Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 291 f.; *Konigsmann*, De fontibus, &c., in Pott's Sylloge, iii. p. 231 f.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, 1869, p. 213 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. l. ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 207 f.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., 1845, p. 239 f., p. 348 ff.; *Scholten*, Het paulin. Evangelie, p. 413 ff.; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen, u. s. w., p. 168 ff., 140 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 205 f.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 6; *Strauss*, Das Leben Jesu, 1864, p. 127; *Ulrich*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1837, p. 369 ff.; 1840, p. 1003 ff.; *Volkmar*, Die Religion Jesu, p. 291; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 247; Apostelgesch., p. xxxviii.; *Wittichen*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1873, p. 509 f.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 515 f. Cf. *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 229; cf. p. 1 f.

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, p. 16 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 24 f., 54, 269 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 34, anm. 1, 383 ff., 452 ff.; ii. p. 245 f.; Allg. K. G., i. p. 165 ff.; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitgesch., iii., p. 421 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 608 ff.; Die Evangelien, p. 225; *Holtzmann*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1873, p. 85 ff.; *Köstlin*, Ursprung., u. s. w., p. 286 ff.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 6 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. l. ff., lxiii. f.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., 1845, p. 239 ff., 305 f., 347 ff.; *Scholten*, Het paulin. Evang., p. 412 ff.; Is de derde Evangelist de Schrijver van het Boek der Handelingen? 1873, p. 98 f.; *Schwanbeck*, Quell. Schr. Lukas, p. 253 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 38 ff., 73 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 14 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 203 ff.; *Strauss*, Das Leben Jesu, p. 126 f.; *Tjeenk-Willink*, Just. Martyr in zijne verh. tot Paulus, 1868, p. 64; *Volkmar*, Die Religion Jesu, p. 291; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 206 f., 244 f.; Apostelgesch., p. xxxviii. f.; *Wittichen*, Zeitschr. wiss.

A careful study of the contents of the Acts cannot, we think, leave any doubt upon an unprejudiced mind that the work could not have been written by any companion or intimate friend of the Apostle Paul.[1] In here briefly indicating some of the reasons for this statement, we shall be under the necessity of anticipating, without much explanation or argument, points which will be more fully discussed further on, and which now, stated without preparation, may not be sufficiently clear to some readers. They may hereafter seem more conclusive. It is impossible to believe that a friend or companion could have written so unhistorical and defective a history of the Apostle's life and teaching. The Pauline Epistles are nowhere directly referred to, but where we can compare the narrative and representations of Acts with the statements of the Apostle, they are strikingly contradictory.[2]

Th., 1873, p. 508 ff.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 460 ff.; Vorträge, u. s. w., 1865, p. 206 ff. Cf. *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 194-208; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 508, 556.

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 16 ff. passim; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 271 f.; *Holtzmann*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1873, p. 87 f.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 239 f., 360 ff., 367 ff.; *Scholten*, Het paulin. Ev., p. 414; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen, u. s. w., p. 262 f.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 203 ff.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 245; Apostelgesch., p. xxxviii. f.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 462 ff.; Vorträge, u. s. w., p. 206 ff. Cf. *Reuss*, Hist. de la Théologie Chrét. 3me éd., ii. p. 343; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xiii. f.

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 8 f., 123 ff., 149 f., et passim; K. G. 3te Aufl., i. p. 126 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 212 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., p. 40 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 27, 412 f., et passim; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitgesch., iii. p. 422 ff., anm. 7; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 224 ff., 593 ff.; Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1860, p. 111 ff., 118 ff., 135 ff.; *Krenkel* Paulus, p. 32 ff., 62 ff.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's Bibel-Lex. (s. v. Apostelconvent), i. p. 194 ff.; *Nicolas*, Études crit. sur la Bible, N. Test., 1864, p. 267 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. lix., anm. * *; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, xxix. ff.; *Scherer*, Rev. de Théologie, 1851, iii. p. 336; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 368 ff.; *Scholten*, Het paulin. Evang., p. 447 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 536 f., 543 ff.; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen, u. s. w., p. 30 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 116 ff., ii. p. 82 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 135 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 47 ff., 82 ff., 97 ff., et

His teaching in the one scarcely presents a trace of the strong and clearly defined doctrines of the other, and the character and conduct of the Paul of Acts are altogether different from those of Paul of the Epistles. According to Paul himself (Gal. i. 16—18), after his conversion, he communicated not with flesh and blood, neither went up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before him, but immediately went away into Arabia, and returned to Damascus, and only after three years he went up to Jerusalem to visit Kephas, and abode with him fifteen days, during which visit none other of the Apostles did he see "save James, the brother of the Lord." If assurance of the correctness of these details were required, Paul gives it by adding (v. 20): "Now the things which I am writing to you, behold before God I lie not." According to Acts (ix. 19—30), however, the facts are quite different. Paul immediately begins to preach in Damascus, does not visit Arabia at all, but, on the contrary, goes to Jerusalem, where, under the protection of Barnabas (v. 26, 27), he is introduced to the Apostles, and "was with them going in and out." According to Paul (Gal. i. 22), his face was after that unknown unto the churches of Judæa, whereas, according to Acts, not only was he "going in and out" at Jerusalem with the Apostles, but (ix. 29) preached boldly in the name of the Lord, and (Acts xxvi. 20) "in Jerusalem and throughout all the region of Judæa," he urged to repentance. According to Paul (Gal. ii. 1ff.), after fourteen years he went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus,

passim; *Tjeenk-Willink*, Just. Martyr, 1868, p. 27 f., p. 31, noot 3; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 245; Apostelg., p. xxxv ff.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 216 ff,. et passim; Vorträge, u. s. w., p. 206 ff. Cf. *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., 2te Aufl., p. 11 ff.

"according to a revelation," and "privately" communicated his Gospel "to those who seemed to be something," as, with some irony, he calls the Apostles. In words still breathing irritation and determined independence, Paul relates to the Galatians the particulars of that visit—how great pressure had been exerted to compel Titus, though a Greek, to be circumcised, "that they might bring us into bondage," to whom, "not even for an hour did we yield the required subjection." He protests, with proud independence, that the Gospel which he preaches was not received from man nor taught to him (Gal. i. 11, 12), but revealed to him by God (verses 15, 16); and during this visit (ii. 6, 7) "from those seeming to be something (*τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι*), whatsoever they were it makes no matter to me—God accepts not man's person—for to me those who seemed (*οἱ δοκοῦντες*) communicated nothing additional." According to Acts, after his conversion, Paul is taught by a man named Ananias what he must do (ix. 6, xxii. 10); he makes visits to Jerusalem (xi. 30, xii, 25, &c.), which are excluded by Paul's own explicit statements; and a widely different report is given (xv. 1ff.) of the second visit. Paul does not go, "according to a revelation," but is deputed by the Church of Antioch, with Barnabas, in consequence of disputes regarding the circumcision of Gentiles, to lay the case before the Apostles and elders at Jerusalem. It is almost impossible in the account here given of proceedings characterised throughout by perfect harmony, forebearance, and unanimity of views, to recognize the visit described by Paul. Instead of being private, the scene is a general council of the Church. The fiery independence of Paul is transformed into meekness and submission. There is not a word of the

endeavour to compel him to have Titus circumcised—all is peace and undisturbed good-will. Peter pleads the cause of Paul, and is more Pauline in his sentiments than Paul himself, and, in the very presence of Paul, claims to have been selected by God to be Apostle of the Gentiles (xv. 7—11). Not a syllable is said of the scene at Antioch shortly after (Gal. ii. 11ff.), so singularly at variance with the proceedings of the council, when Paul withstood Cephas to the face. Then, who would recognize the Paul of the Epistles in the Paul of Acts, who makes such repeated journeys to Jerusalem to attend Jewish feasts (xviii. 21,[1] xix. 21, xx. 16, xxiv. 11, 17, 18); who, in his journeys, halts on the days when a Jew may not travel (xx. 5, 6); who shaves his head at Cenchrea because of a vow (xviii. 18); who, at the recommendation of the Apostles, performs that astonishing act of Nazariteship in the Temple (xxi. 23), and afterwards follows it up by a defence of such "excellent dissembling" (xxiii. 6, xxiv. 11ff.); who circumcises Timothy, the son of a Greek and of a Jewess, with his own hands (xvi. 1—3, cf. Gal. v. 2); and who is so little the apostle of the uncircumcision that he only tardily goes to the Gentiles when rejected by the Jews (cf. xviii. 6). Paul is not only robbed of the honour of being the first Apostle of the Gentiles, which is conferred upon Peter, but the writer seems to avoid even calling him an apostle at all,[2] the only occasions upon which he does so being indirect (xiv. 4, 14); and the title equally applied to Barnabas, whose claim to it is more than doubted. The

[1] The Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrian, with other ancient codices, omit: "I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem."

[2] *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 585; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. iii. note, p. xiii. f.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 206; *Wittichen*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 73, p. 513 f.

passages in which this occurs, moreover, are not above suspicion, "the Apostles" being omitted in Cod. D. (Bezæ) from xiv. 14. The former verse in that codex has important variations from other MSS.

If we cannot believe that the representation actually given of Paul in the Acts could proceed from a friend or companion of the Apostle, it is equally impossible that such a person could have written his history with so many extraordinary imperfections and omissions. We have already pointed out that between chs. ix.—xiv. are compressed the events of seventeen of the most active years of the Apostle's life, and also that a long period is comprised within the ἡμεῖς sections, during which such minute details of the daily itinerary are given. The incidents reported, however, are quite disproportionate to those which are omitted. We have no record, for instance, of his visit to Arabia at so interesting a portion of his career (Gal. i. 17), although the particulars of his conversion are repeated with singular variations no less than three times (ix. xxii. xxvi.); nor of his preaching in Illyria (Rom. xv. 19); nor of the incident referred to in Rom. xvi. 3, 4. The momentous adventures in the cause of the Gospel spoken of in 2 Cor. xi. 23ff. receive scarcely any illustration in Acts, nor is any notice taken of his fighting with wild beasts at Ephesus (1 Cor. xv. 32), which would have formed an episode full of serious interest. What, again, was "the affliction which happened in Asia," which so overburdened even so energetic a nature as that of the Apostle that "he despaired even of life?" (2 Cor. ii. 8f.) Some light upon these points might reasonably have been expected from a companion of Paul. Then, xvii. 14—16, xviii. 5, contradict 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2, in a way scarcely possible in such a

companion, present with the Apostle at Athens; and in like manner the representation in xxviii. 17—22, is inconsistent with such a person, ignoring as it does the fact that there already was a Christian Church in Rome (Ep. to Romans). We do not refer to the miraculous elements so thickly spread over the narrative of the Acts, and especially in the episode xvi. 25ff., which is inserted in the first ἡμεῖς section, as irreconcilable with the character of an eye-witness, because it is precisely the miraculous portion of the book which is on its trial; but we may ask whether it would have been possible for such a friend, acquainted with the Apostle's representations in 1 Cor. xiv. 2ff. cf. xii.—xiv., and the phenomena there described, to speak of the gift of "tongues" at Pentecost as the power of speaking different languages (ii. 4—11, cf. x. 46, xix. 6)?

It will readily be understood that we have here merely rapidly and by way of illustration referred to a few of the points which seem to preclude the admission that the general author of the Acts could be an eye-witness,[1] or companion of the Apostle Paul, and this will become more apparent as we proceed, and more closely examine the contents of the book. Who that author was, there are now no means of ascertaining. The majority of critics who have most profoundly examined the problem presented by the Acts, however, and who do not admit Luke to be the general author, are agreed that the author compiled the ἡμεῖς sections from a diary kept by some companion of the Apostle Paul during the journeys and voyages to which they relate, but opinion is very divided as to the person

[1] *Bleek* does not consider it probable that he narrates anything as eye-witness. Einl. N. T., p. 340.

to whom that diary must be ascribed. It is of course admitted that the various theories regarding his identity are merely based upon conjecture, but they have long severely exercised critical ingenuity. A considerable party adopt the conclusion that the diary was probably written by Luke.[1] This theory has certainly the advantage of whatever support may be derived from tradition; and it has been conjectured, not without probability, that this diary, being either written by, or originally attributed to, Luke, may possibly have been the source from which, in course of time, the whole of the Acts, and consequently the Gospel, came to be ascribed to Luke.[2] The selection of a comparatively less known name than that of Timothy, Titus or Silas,[3] for instance, may thus be explained; but, besides, it has the great advantage that, the name of Luke never being mentioned in the Acts, he is not exposed to criticism, which has found serious objections to the claims of other better known followers of Paul.

There are, however, many critics who find difficulties in the way of accepting Luke as the author of the "we" sections, and who adopt the theory that they were pro-

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 16 f., 243; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, ii. p. 245 f.; cf. i. p. 383 ff., 422 ff.; Allg. K. G., i. p. 165 f., 237; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeit., iii. p. 422 f., anm. 7; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 606 ff., Die Evangelien, p. 225; *Holtzmann*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1873, p. 85 ff.; *Köstlin*, Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 291 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. l. ff.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 205; *Volkmar*, Die Religion Jesu, p. 291; *Wittichen*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1873, p. 509 f.; *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 515 f. Cf. *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 229; cf., p. 1 f.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 207. We only refer here, of course, to writers who do not consider Luke the author of the rest of Acts.

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 16 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette's Apg., p. l. ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 608; *Köstlin*, Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 291; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, ii. p. 245 f.; *Zeller*, Apostelg., p. 515 f.

[3] *Scholten*, Het paulin. Evangelie, p. 416.

bably composed by Timothy.[1] It is argued that, if Luke had been the writer of this diary, he must have been in very close relations to Paul, having been his companion during the Apostle's second mission journey, as well as during the later European journey, and finally during the eventful journey of Paul as a prisoner from Cæsarea to Rome. Under these circumstances, it is natural to expect that Paul should mention him in his earlier epistles, written before the Roman imprisonment, but this he nowhere does. For instance, no mention whatever is made of Luke in either of the letters to the Corinthians nor in those to the Thessalonians; but on the other hand, Timothy's name, together with that of Silvanus (or Silas), is joined to Paul's in the two letters to the Thessalonians, besides being mentioned in the body of the first Epistle (iii. 2, 6); and he is repeatedly and affectionately spoken of in the earlier letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10), and his name is likewise combined with the Apostle's in the second Epistle (2 Cor. i. 1), as well as mentioned in the body of the letter, along with that of Silvanus, as a fellow-preacher with Paul. In the Epistle to the Philippians, later, the name of Luke does not appear, although, had he been the companion of the Apostle from Troas, he must have been known to the Philippians, but on the other hand, Timothy is again associated in the opening greeting of that Epistle. Timothy is known to have

[1] *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 332 ff.; Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1030 ff.; *Beyschlag*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1864, p. 214 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 273 ff.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 376, cf. 354, anm. 1; Vorlesungen *ap. De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 247, § 115 b, anm. a; *Ulrich*, Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1837, p. 369 ff.; 1840, p. 1003 ff.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 247; Apostelgesch., p. xxxviii. f. Cf. *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 81, anm. 1, 2; *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 229, cf. 1 f.

been a fellow-worker with the Apostle, and to have accompanied him in his missionary journeys, and he is repeatedly mentioned in the Acts as the companion of Paul, and the first occasion is precisely where the ἡμεῖς sections commence.[1] In connection with Acts xv. 40, xvi. 3, 10, it is considered that Luke is quite excluded from the possibility of being the companion who wrote the diary we are discussing, by the Apostle's own words in 2 Cor. i. 19:[2] "For the Son of God, Christ Jesus, who was preached among you by us, by me and Silvanus and Timothy," &c., &c. The eye-witness who wrote the journal from which the ἡμεῖς portions are taken, must have been with the Apostle in Corinth, and, it is of course always asserted, must have been one of his συνεργοί, and preached the Gospel.[3] Is it possible, on the supposition that this fellow-labourer was Luke, that the Apostle could in so marked a manner have excluded his name by clearly defining that "us" only meant himself and Silvanus and Timothy? Mayerhoff[4] has gone even further than the critics we have referred to, and maintains Timothy to be the author of the third Synoptic and of Acts.

We may briefly add that some writers have conjectured Silas to be the author of the ἡμεῖς sections,[5] and others

[1] xvi. 1 ff.; cf. xvii. 14, 15; xviii. 5; xix. 22, xx. 4.

[2] *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 81, anm. 2.

[3] Cf. *Wordsworth*, Greek Test., The Four Gospels, 1875, p. 168; Acts of the Apost., 1874, p. 118. The Bishop of Lincoln considers that the vision which appeared to Paul (Acts xvi. 9), praying him to come over into Macedonia, was regarded by Luke as a message also designed for himself: "and the Holy Spirit, in the Acts of the Apostles, authorises that opinion. Therefore, St. Luke also, as well as the Apostle, was called by the Holy Ghost to *preach the Gospel in Greece*." Four Gospels, p. 168.

[4] Einl. petr. Schriften, p. 6 ff.

[5] *Hauber*, Betract. üb. einig. d. erst. Glaubigen, u. s. w., christl. Kirche, p. 61 f.; *Kohlreif*, Chron. Sacra, p. 99; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen, u. s. w., p. 168 ff. Cf. *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, p. 81, anm. 1, 2.

have referred them to Titus.[1] It is evident that whether the ἡμεῖς sections be by the unknown author of the rest of the Acts, or be part of a diary by some unknown companion of Paul, introduced into the work by the general editor, they do not solve the problem as to the identity of the author who remains absolutely unknown.

We have said enough to enable the reader to understand the nature of the problem regarding the author of the third Synoptic, and of the Acts of the Apostles, and whilst for our purpose much less would have sufficed, it is evident that the materials do not exist for identifying him. The stupendous miracles related in these two works, therefore, rest upon the evidence of an unknown writer, who from internal evidence must have composed them very long after the events recorded. Externally there is no proof even of the existence of the Acts until towards the end of the second century, when also for the first time we hear of a vague theory as to the name and identity of the supposed author, a theory which declares Luke not to have himself been an eye-witness of the occurrences related in the Gospel, and which reduces his participation even in the events narrated in the Acts to a very small and modest compass, leaving the great mass of the miracles described in the work without even his personal attestation. The theory, however, we have seen to be not only unsupported by evidence, but to be contradicted by many potent circumstances. We propose now, without exhaustively examining the contents of the Acts, which would itself require a separate treatise, at least to

[1] *Horst*, Essai sur les sources de la deuxième partie des Actes des Apôtres, 1848; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 214 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 6. We do not think it necessary to consider the theory that the sections we have been discussing are altogether a fiction. *Br. Bauer*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 132 f.; cf. *Schrader*, Der Apostel Paulus, v. p. 549.

consider some of its main points sufficiently to form a fair judgment of the historical value of the work, although the facts which we have already ascertained are clearly fatal to the document as adequate testimony for miracles, and the reality of Divine Revelation.

CHAPTER III.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK. DESIGN AND COMPOSITION.

THE historical value of the Acts of the Apostles has very long been the subject of vehement discussion, and the course of the controversy has certainly not been favourable to the position of the work. For a considerable time of course the traditional view continued to prevail, and little or no doubt of the absolute credibility of the narrative was ever expressed. When the spirit of independent and enlightened criticism was finally aroused, it had to contend with opinions which habit had rendered stereotype, and prejudices which took the form of hereditary belief. As might naturally be expected, many writers in more recent times have defended the authenticity of the Acts and asserted that the work is substantially historical and trustworthy; and, at the present day, apologists still express unshaken confidence in its character and enthusiastic faith in its truth and inspiration. On the other hand, a large body of eminent critics, after an exhaustive investigation of the Acts, have concluded that the work is not historically accurate, and cannot be accepted as a true account of the Acts and teaching of the Apostles.[1]

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 8 ff., 19 ff., 96 ff., 119 ff., 134 ff., 143, anm. 1, 166, 189 et passim; K. G., i. p. 125 f.; *Br. Bauer*, Apostelgesch., 1850,

The Author of the Acts has been charged with having written the work with a distinct design to which he subordinated historical truth, and in this view many critics have joined, who ultimately do not accuse him absolutely of falsifying history, but merely of making a deliberate selection of his materials and of placing them in the point of view most suitable for his purpose. Most of those, however, who make this charge maintain that, in carrying out the original purpose of the Acts, the writer so freely manipulated whatever materials he had before him, and so dealt with facts whether by omission, transformation or invention, that the historical value of his narrative has been destroyed or at least seriously affected by it.[1]

p. 114 ff.; *Christianus*, Das Ev. des Reichs, p. 767 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 207 ff., 275 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 27 f., p. 383 ff., 421 f. (second part historical, cf. 422 ff.); *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., iii. p. 420 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1860, p. 101 ff.; Einl. N. T., p. 225 ff., 574 ff., 593 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 350 f.; in Schenkel's Bibel Lex., i. p. 213 f.; Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1873, p. 86 ff.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 6 ff., 212 ff.; *Nicolas*, Études N. T., p. 267 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. lix. ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 277 ff., 495 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxiv. ff. (except last pages, p. xxvii.); *Scherer*, Rev. de Théologie, 1851, iii. p. 335 f.; *Scholten*, Het paul. Evang., p. 410, 414, 447 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 508 ff. passim; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen, u. s. w., p. 31 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 90, ii. p. 73 ff., 112 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 117 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 17 ff., et passim; *Tjeenk-Willink*, Just. Mart., p. 28 f., 31 noot 3; *Volkmar*, Die Religion, p. 336 ff.; *Zeller*, Apostelg., p. 76 ff., 316 ff.; Vorträge, p. 206 ff. Cf. *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 344 ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 203 f., 205 f.; Hist. Théol. Chrét., ii. p. 7, 327 ff.; *Réville*, Essais de Critique Religieuse, 1860, p. 27 f.; *Schneckenburger*, p. 151 ff., et passim; *De Wette*, Apostelg., p. lix f.; Einl. N. T., p. 252 f.; *Wittichen*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1873, p. 512 ff.

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 8 ff., 19 ff.; *Christianus*, Ev. des Reichs, p. 767 ff.; *Davidson*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 275; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., iii. p. 420 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 225 ff., 575 ff., 593 ff.; Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1860, p. 101 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 350 ff.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 6 ff., 212 ff.; *Nicolas*, Études N. T., p. 267 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. xxv. ff., lix. ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxiv. ff. (except last few pages, p. xxvii.); *Réville*, Essais de Crit. Rel., p. 27 f.; *Scherer*, Rev. de Théol., 1851, iii. p. 336; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 73 ff.; *Straatman*,

On the other hand, many apologetic writers altogether deny the existence of any design on the part of the author such as is here indicated, which could have led him to suppress or distort facts,[1] and whilst some of them advance very varied and fanciful theories as to the historical plan upon which the writer proceeds, and in accordance with which the peculiarities of his narrative are explained, they generally accept the work as the genuine history of the Acts of the Apostles so far as the author possessed certain information. The design most generally ascribed to the writer of the Acts may, with many minor variations, be said to be apologetic and conciliatory: an attempt to reconcile the two parties in the early church by representing the difference between the views of Peter and Paul as slight and unimportant, Pauline sentiments being freely placed in the mouth of Peter, and the Apostle of the Gentiles being represented as an orthodox adherent of the church of Jerusalem, with scarcely such advanced views of christian universality as Peter; or else an effort of Gentile Christianity to bring itself into closer union with the primitive church, surrendering, in so doing, all its distinctive features and its Pauline origin, and representing the universalism by which it exists, as a principle adopted and promulgated from the very first by Peter and the Twelve. It is not

Paulus, p. 1 ff.; *Zeller*, Apostelg., p. 76 ff., 316 ff.; Vorträge, p. 206 ff. Cf. *Reuss*, Hist. Théol. Chr., ii. p. 7, 327 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Apostelg., p. 44 ff., 57 f., 92 f., 127 f., 140 f., 152 ff., 217 f.

[1] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 17; *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 328 ff., 345 f.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 23 ff.; *Ewald*, Jahrb. bibl. Wiss., ix. p. 62 ff.; *Grau*, Entw. N. T., Schriftth., i. p. 320 ff.; *Guericke*, Gesammtg. N. T., p. 270 ff.; *Lange*, Das ap. Zeit., i. p. 87 ff.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 7 ff., 159; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 189 ff., 374; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 8 ff.; *Neudecker*, Einl. N. T., p. 344 ff.; *Oertel*, Paulus, p. 165 ff., 182 ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 496 ff.; *de Pressensé*, Hist. trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 484 f.; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 261 ff.

necessary, however, for us to enter upon any minute discussion of this point, nor is it requisite, for the purposes of our inquiry, to determine whether the peculiar character of the writing which we are examining is the result of a perfectly definite purpose controlling the whole narrative and modifying every detail, or naturally arises from the fact that it is the work of a pious member of the church writing long after the events related, and imbuing his materials, whether of legend or ecclesiastical tradition, with his own thoroughly orthodox views: history freely composed for Christian edification. We shall not endeavour to construct any theory to account for the phenomena before us, but taking them as they are, without seeking to discover the secret motives or intentions of the writer, we shall simply examine some of the more important portions of the narrative, with a view to determine whether the work can in any serious sense be regarded as credible history.

No one can examine the contents of the Acts without perceiving that some secret motive or influence did certainly govern the writer's mind, and guide him in the selection of topics, and this is betrayed by many peculiarities in his narrative. Quite apart from any attempt to discover precisely what that motive was, it is desirable that we should briefly point out some of these peculiarities. It is evident that every man who writes a history must commence with a distinct plan, and that the choice of subjects to be introduced or omitted must proceed upon a certain principle. This is of course an invariable rule wherever there is order and arrangement. No one has ever questioned that in the Acts of the Apostles both order and arrangement have been deliberately adopted, and the question naturally arises: What was the plan of

the author? and upon what principle did he select, from the mass of facts which might have been related regarding the Church in the Apostolic ages, precisely those which he has inserted, to the exclusion of the rest?[1] What title will adequately represent the contents of the book? for it is admitted by almost all critics that the actual name which the book bears neither was given to it by its author nor properly describes its intention and subject.[2] The extreme difficulty which has been felt in answering these questions, and in constructing any hypothesis which may fairly correspond with the actual contents of the Acts, constitutes one of the most striking commentaries on the work, and although we cannot here detail the extremely varied views of critics upon the subject, they are well worthy of study.[3] No one now advances the theory which was anciently current that the author simply narrated that of which he was an eye-witness.[4] Its present title *πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων* would lead us to expect an account of the doings of the Apostles in general, but we have nothing like this in the book.

[1] *Lekebusch*, Die Comp. u. Entst. d. Apostelgesch., 1854, p. 190 f.

[2] Perhaps the perfectly vague designation of the book "Acts," Πράξεις, in the Cod. Sinaiticus, may be taken as the closest—if most vague—description of its contents.

[3] The reader may be referred, amongst many others, to the following works: *Baur*, K. G., i. p. 125 ff.; *Bertholdt*, Einl., iii. p. 1333 ff.; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 325 ff.; *Credner*, Einl., i. p. 268 ff., 283 f.; *Ebrard*, zu Olshausen's Apg., p. 318 anm.; *Eichhorn*, Einl., ii. p. 16 ff.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 28 ff.; *Feilmoser*, Einl., p. 295 ff.; *Guericke*, Gesammtg. N. T., p. 269 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl., p. 593 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 329 ff.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 189 ff.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 5f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 8 ff.; *Oertel*, Paulus, p. 165 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. xxv. ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 205 ff.; Hist. Théol. Chr., ii. p. 327 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Zweck Apg., p. 45 ff.; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 33 f., 63 ff.; *De Wette*, Einl., p. 241 ff.; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test., Acts, p. 1 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 316 ff.

[4] Cf. *Hieron.*, De vir. ill. 7; *Eusebius*, H. E., iii. 4; Can. Murat., ed. *Tregelles*, p. 18 f.

Peter and Paul occupy the principal parts of the narrative, and the other Apostles are scarcely mentioned. James is introduced as an actor in the famous Council, and represented as head of the church in Jerusalem, but it is much disputed that he was an Apostle, or one of the Twelve. The death of James the brother of John is just mentioned. John is represented on several occasions during the earlier part of the narrative as the companion of Peter, without, however, being prominently brought forward; and the rest of the Twelve are left in complete obscurity. It is not a history of the labours of Peter and Paul, for not only is considerable importance given to the episodes of Stephen and Philip the Evangelist, but the account of the two great Apostles is singularly fragmentary. After a brief chronicle of the labours of Peter, he suddenly disappears from the scene, and we hear of him no more. Paul then becomes the prominent figure in the drama; but we have already pointed out how defective is the information given regarding him, and he is also abandoned as soon as he is brought to Rome: of his subsequent career and martyrdom, nothing whatever is said. The work is not, as Luther suggested, a gloss on the Epistles of Paul and the inculcation of his doctrine of righteousness through faith, for the narrative of the Acts, so far as we can compare it with the Epistles, which are nowhere named in it, is generally in contradiction with them, and the doctrine of justification by faith is conspicuous by its absence. It is not a history of the first Christian missions, for it ignores entirely the labours of most of the Apostles, omits all mention of some of the most interesting missionary journeys, and does not even give a report of the introduction of Christianity into Rome. It is not in any

sense a Paulinian history of the Church, for if, on the one side, it describes the Apostles of the circumcision as promulgating the universalism which Paul preached, it robs him of his originality, dwarfs his influence upon the development of Christianity, and is, on the other hand, too defective to represent church history, whether from a Paulinian or any other standpoint. The favourite theory: that the writer designed to relate the story of the spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome, can scarcely be maintained, although it certainly has the advantage of a vagueness of proportions equally suitable to the largest and most limited treatment of history. But, in such a case, we have a drama with the main incident omitted; for the introduction of the Gospel into Rome is not described at all, and whilst the author could not consider the personal arrival at Rome of the Apostle Paul the climax of his history, he at once closes his account where the final episode ought to have commenced.

From all points of view, and upon any hypothesis, the Acts of the Apostles is so obviously incomplete as a history, so fragmentary and defective as biography, that critics have to the present day failed in framing any theory which could satisfactorily account for its anomalies, and have almost been forced to explain them by supposing a partial, apologetic or conciliatory, design, which removes the work from the region of veritable history. The whole interest of the narrative, of course, centres in the two representative Apostles, Peter and Paul, who alternately fill the scene. It is difficult to say, however, whether the account of the Apostle of the Circumcision or of Paul is the more capriciously partial and incomplete. After his miraculous liberation from the prison into which he had been cast by Herod,

the doings of Peter are left unchronicled, and although he is reintroduced for a moment to plead the cause of the Gentiles at the Council in Jerusalem, he then finally retires from the scene, to give place to Paul. The omissions from the history of Paul are very remarkable, and all the more so from the extreme and unnecessary detail of the itinerary of some of his journeys, and neither the blanks, on the one hand, nor the excessive minuteness, on the other, are to be explained by any theory connected with personal knowledge on the part of Theophilus. Of the general history of the primitive Church and the life and labours of the Twelve, we are told little or nothing. According to the author the propagation of the Gospel was carried on more by angelic agency than apostolic enthusiasm. There is a liberal infusion of miraculous episodes in his history, but a surprising scarcity of facts. Even where the author is best informed, as in the second part of the Acts, the narrative of Paul's labours and missionary journeys, while presenting striking omissions, is really minute and detailed only in regard to points of no practical interest, leaving both the distinctive teaching of the Apostle, and the internal economy of the Church almost entirely unrepresented. Does this defective narrative of the Acts of the Apostles proceed from poverty of information, or from the arbitrary selection of materials for a special purpose? As we proceed, it will become increasingly evident that, limited although the writer's materials are, the form into which they have been moulded has undoubtedly been determined either by a dominant theory, or a deliberate design, neither of which is consistent with the composition of sober history.

This is particularly apparent in the representation

which is given of the two principal personages of the narrative. Critics have long clearly recognised that the Author of the Acts has carefully arranged his materials so as to present as close a parallelism as possible between the Apostles Peter and Paul.[1] We shall presently see how closely he assimilates their teaching, ascribing the views of Paul to Peter, and putting Petrine sentiments in the mouth of Paul, but here we shall merely refer to points of general history. If Peter has a certain pre-eminence as a distinguished member of the original Apostolic body, the equal claim of Paul to the honours of the Apostolate, whilst never directly advanced, is prominently suggested by the narration, no less than three times, of the circumstances of his conversion and direct call to the office by the glorified Jesus. The first miracle ascribed to Peter is the healing of "a certain man lame from his mother's womb" (τις ἀνὴρ χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ) at the beautiful gate of the Temple,[2] and the first wonder performed by Paul is also the healing of "a certain man lame from his mother's womb" (τις ἀνὴρ χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ) at Lystra;[3] Ananias and Sapphira are punished through the instrumentality of Peter,[4] and Elymas is smitten with blindness at the word of Paul;[5]

[1] *Baur*, Tüb. Zeitschr., 1838, H. iii. p. 142 f.; Paulus, i. p. 8 f.; K. G., i. p. 127 f.; *Christianus*, Ev. des Reichs, p. 767 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 275 ff.; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., iii. p. 420 ff., 427 f.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii., p. 350 f.; in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 213 f.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 201 f.; *Noack*, Urspr. des Christenthums, 1857, p. 283, 288; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 495 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxviii.; *Réville*, Essais, p. 27 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Zweck Apg., p. 52 ff., 212 f.; *Scholten*, Het paulin. Evang., p. 463 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 76 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 123 ff.; *Volkmar*, Die Rel. Jesu, p. 341 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 320 ff. Cf. *Lightfoot*, Epistles of St. Paul, Galatians, 4th ed., p. 342; *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 79, 121 f.

[2] iii. 2 ff. [3] xiv. 8 ff. [4] v. 1 ff. [5] xiii. 11 f.

the sick are laid in the streets that the shadow of Peter may fall upon them, and they are healed, as are also those vexed with unclean spirits;[1] handkerchiefs or aprons are taken to the sick from the body of Paul, and they are healed, and the evil spirits go out of them;[2] Peter withstands Simon the sorcerer,[3] as Paul does the sorcerer Elymas and the exorcists at Ephesus;[4] if Peter heals the paralytic Æneas at Lydda,[5] Paul restores to health the fever-stricken father of Publius at Melita;[6] Peter raises from the dead Tabitha, a disciple at Joppa,[7] and Paul restores to life the disciple Eutychus at Troas;[8] Cornelius falls at the feet of Peter, and worships him, Peter preventing him, and saying: "Rise up! I myself also am a man,"[9] and in like manner the people of Lystra would have done sacrifice to Paul, and he prevents them, crying out: "We also are men of like passions with you;"[10] Peter lays his hands on the people of Samaria, and they receive the Holy Ghost and the gift of tongues,[11] and Paul does the same for believers at Ephesus;[12] Peter is brought before the council,[13] and so is Paul;[14] the one is imprisoned and twice released by an angel,[15] and the other is delivered from his bonds by a great earthquake;[16] if Peter be scourged by order of the council,[17] Paul is beaten with many stripes at the command of the magistrates of Philippi.[18] It is maintained that the desire to equalise the sufferings of the two Apostles in the cause of the

[1] v. 12, 15 f.
[2] xix. 11, 12.
[3] viii. 20 ff.
[4] xiii. 11 f., xix. 13 ff.
[5] ix. 33 f.
[6] xxviii. 8
[7] ix. 36 ff.
[8] xx. 9 ff.
[9] x. 25, 26.
[10] xiv. 13 ff., cf. xxviii. 6.
[11] viii. 14 ff., x. 44 ff., &c., &c.
[12] xix. 1 ff.
[13] v. 21 ff.
[14] xxii. 30, xxiii. 1 ff.
[15] v. 19, xii. 6 ff.
[16] xvi. 26.
[17] v. 40.
[18] xvi. 22 f.

Gospel, as he has equalised their miraculous displays, probably led the Author to omit all mention of those perils and persecutions to which the Apostle Paul refers in support of his protest, that he had laboured and suffered more than all the rest.[1] If Paul was called by a vision to the ministry of the Gentiles,[2] so Peter is represented as having been equally directed by a vision to baptize the Gentile Cornelius;[3] the double vision of Peter and Cornelius has its parallel in the double vision of Paul and Ananias. It is impossible to deny the measured equality thus preserved between the two Apostles, or to ignore the fact that parallelism like this is the result of premeditation, and cannot claim the character of impartial history.

The speeches form an important element in the Acts of the Apostles, and we shall now briefly examine them, reserving, however, for future consideration their dogmatic aspect. Few, if any writers, however apologetic, maintain that these discourses can possibly have been spoken exactly as they are recorded in the Acts. The utmost that is asserted is that they are substantially historical, and fairly represent the original speeches.[4] They were

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff., 1 Cor. xv. 10; *Stap*, Études sur les Origines, &c., p. 124 f.

[2] ix. 6, 15 f.

[3] x. 9 ff., xi. 1 ff., xv. 7.

[4] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 13 ff.; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 346 f.; *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 683 ff.; *Guericke*, Gesammtg. N. T., p. 275 ff.; *Kähler*, Th. Stud. u. Kr., 1873, p. 492 ff.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 30, 146 ff.; *Meyer*, Apg., 13; *Michaelis*, Einl., ii. p. 1180 ff.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 1 ff., 57 anm. 2, 65 anm. 1, 150 anm. 2, et passim; *Ocrtel*, Paulus, p. 69 ff.; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 9 ff.; *de Pressensé*, Hist., i. p. 485; *Riehm*, De fontibus, &c., p. 75 ff., 127 ff., 148 ff.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl., p. 373 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 129 ff., 156 f.; *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 70 ff., 84 ff.; *Tholuck*, Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 307 ff.; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 187 ff.; *Weiss*, Der petr., Lehrbegriff, 1855, p. 5 ff., 147 ff. Cf. *Mayerhoff*, as regards the latter half of the Acts only, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 19 ff., 219 ff.

derived, it is alleged, either from written sources, or oral tradition, and many, especially in the second part, are supposed to have been delivered in the presence of the Author of the work. This view is held, of course, with a greater or less degree of assurance as to the closeness of the relation which our record bears to the original addresses; but, without here very closely scrutinizing hesitation or reticence, our statement fairly renders the apologetic position. A large body of able critics, however, deny the historical character of these speeches,[1] and consider them mere free compositions from the Author of the Acts, at the best being on a par with the speeches which many ancient writers place in the mouths of their historical personages, and giving only what the writer supposed that the speaker would say under the circumstances. That the writer may have made use of such materials as were within his reach, or endeavoured to embody the ideas which tradition may broadly have preserved, may possibly be admitted, but that these discourses can seriously be accepted as conveying a correct report of anything actually spoken by the persons

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. 3 ff., 19 ff., passim; *Br. Bauer*, Apg., p. 76 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 226 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl., ii. p. 36 ff.; *Holsten*, Zum. Ev. des Paulus u. Petrus, 1868, p. 147; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 354 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette's Apg., p. liii. f.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 505 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxviii. f.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 38 f., 52, 199, 206; Hist. Théol. chr., ii. p. 7 f., p. 335 ff.; *Scherer* (first part), Rev. de Théol., 1851, iii. p. 336; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 510, 513, 522, 524, 540 f., et passim; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 73 ff., 97, 102 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, &c., p. 127 ff., 137 ff., et passim; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 62 f., 70 f., 160 ff., 258 f., 286 ff., 341 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 496 ff., 519 ff. Cf. *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 283; Das N. Test., ii. p. 45 anm.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 331 f.; *Mayerhoff* (first part), Einl. petr. Schr., p. 218 ff., 230; *Weiss*, Der petr. Lehrbegriff, p. 5 f., 200 anm. 1; *De Wette*, Einl., p. 250 f., Apg., p. liii. In regard to some speeches, compare *Bleek*, Einl., p. 349 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 383 ff., passim.

in whose mouths they are put is, of course, denied. It is, obviously, extremely improbable that any of these speeches could have been written down at the time.[1] Taking even the supposed case that the Author of the Acts was Luke, and was present when some of the speeches of of Paul were delivered, it is difficult to imagine that he should have immediately recorded his recollection of them, and more than this he could not have done. He must continually have been in the habit of hearing the preaching of Paul, and therefore could not have had the inducement of novelty to make him write down what he heard. The idea of recording them for posterity could not have occurred to such a person, with the belief in the approaching end of all things then prevalent. The Author of Acts was not the companion of Paul, however, and the contents of the speeches, as we shall presently see, are not of a character to make it in the least degree likely that they could have been written down for separate circulation. Many of the speeches in the Acts, moreover, were delivered under circumstances which render it specially unlikely that they could have

[1] Olshausen says: "One cannot, naturally, suppose that these speeches are recorded exactly as they were delivered. We have only to represent to ourselves exciting moments (as for instance the farewell of Paul to the Ephesian Presbyters at Miletus, xx. 17 ff.) to feel the inadequacy of this view. The Paulinian speech in the touching scene so moved their hearts, that all present burst into tears; who thinks on such occasions of a mechanical record of the spoken living discourse? One of course fears that if no instantaneous record was made, all guarantee for the credibility of the speech is lost. Only, this fear obviously proceeds from unbelief in the power of the Spirit of Truth, as has already been observed in the introduction to the Gospels; if we do not suppose this working in the mind of the writer of the Acts, and of the Apostles, under whose eyes he wrote, then we have nowhere any warrant for the contents; if this, however, be recognised, then the free conception of the speeches indicated cannot disturb us or prejudice them." *Olshausen*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 9. Here the apologist takes refuge in a theory of inspiration which is but a sorry shelter from the simplest critical attack.

been reported with any accuracy. At no time an easy task correctly to record a discourse of any length, it is doubly difficult when those speeches, like many in Acts, were spoken under circumstances of great danger or excitement. The experience of modern times, before the application of systems of short-hand, may show how imperfectly speeches were taken down, even where there was deliberate preparation and set purpose to do so; and if it be suggested that some celebrated orations of the last century have so been preserved, it is undeniable that what has been handed down to us not only does not represent the original, but is really almost a subsequent composition, preserving little more than some faint echoes of the true utterance. The probability that a correct record of speeches made, under such circumstances, in the middle of the first century could have been kept, seems exceedingly small. Even, if it could be shown that the Author of the Acts took these speeches substantially from earlier documents, it would not materially tend to establish their authenticity; for the question would still remain perfectly open as to the closeness of those documents to the original discourses; but in the absence of all evidence, whether as to the existence or origin of any such sources, the conjecture of their possible existence can have no weight. We have nothing but internal testimony to examine, and that, we shall see, is totally opposed to the claim to historical value made for those discourses.

Apologists scarcely maintain that we have in the Acts a record of the original discourses in their completeness, but in claiming substantial accuracy most of them include the supposition at least of condensation.[1] The longest

[1] *Lechler* (Das ap. und nachap. Zeit., p. 148, an. 1) quotes from Dr.

discourse in the Acts would not have taken more than six or seven minutes to deliver,[1] and it is impossible to suppose that what is given in the Acts can have been the whole speech delivered on many of the occasions described. For instance, is it probable that King Agrippa who desires to hear Paul, and who comes "with great pomp" with Berenice to do so, should only have heard a speech lasting some five minutes. The Author himself tells us that Paul was not always so brief in his addresses as any one might suppose from the specimens here presented.[2] It is remarkable, however, that not the slightest intimation is given that the speeches are either merely substantially reported or are abridged, and their form and character are evidently designed to convey the impression of complete discourses. If the reader examine any of these discourses, it will be clear that they are concise compositions, betraying no marks of abridgment, and having no fragmentary looseness, but, on the contrary, are highly artificial and finished productions, with a continuous argument. They certainly are singularly inadequate, many of them, to produce the impressions described; but at least it is not possible to discover that material omissions have been made, or that their periods were originally broken by large, or even any, amplification. If these speeches be regarded as complete, and with little or no condensation, another strong element is added to the suspicion as to their authenticity, for such extreme baldness and brevity in the declaration of a new religion,

Stanley (Sermons and Essays, p. 168) the opinion that these speeches are "invaluable models of missionary preaching." In one respect at least—brevity—they certainly are models even for other preaching than that of the missionary.

[1] *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 199.

[2] xx. 7—9.

requiring both explanation and argument, cannot be conceived, and in the case of Paul, with whose system of teaching and doctrine we are well acquainted through his Epistles, it is impossible to accept such meagre and one-sided addresses, as representations of his manner. The statement that the discourses are abridged, and a mere *résumé* of those originally delivered, however, rests upon no authority, is a mere conjecture to account for an existing difficulty, and is in contradiction to the actual form of the speeches in Acts, which evidently are designed to be complete in themselves. Regarding them as complete, it will be found that their incongruity is intensified, but considered as abridged, they have lost in the process all representative character and historical fitness.

It has been argued, indeed, that the different speeches bear evidence to their genuineness from their suitability to the speakers, and to the circumstances under which they are said to have been spoken; but the existence of anything but the most superficial semblance of idiosyncratic character must be denied. The similarity of form, manner, and matter in all the speeches is most remarkable, as will presently be made more apparent, and the whole of the doctrine enunciated amounts to little more than the repetition, in slightly varying words, of the brief exhortation to repentance and belief in Jesus, the Christ, that salvation may be obtained,[1] with references to the ancient history of the Jews, singularly alike in all discourses. Very little artistic skill is necessary to secure a certain suitability of the word to the action, and the action to the word; and certainly evidence is reduced to a very low ebb when such agreement as is presented in the Acts is made an argument for authenticity.

[1] *Reuss*, Hist. de la Théol. chrét., ii. p. 335.

Not only is the consistency of the sentiments uttered by the principal speakers, as compared with what is known of their opinions and character, utterly disputed, but it must be evident that the literary skill of the Author of the Acts was quite equal to so simple a task as preserving at least so much superficial fitness as he displays, and a very much greater amount of verisimilitude might have been attained, as in many works of fiction, without necessarily involving the inference of genuineness.

It has been freely admitted by critics of all schools that the author's peculiarities of style and language are apparent in all the speeches of the Acts,[1] and this has been so often elaborately demonstrated that it is unnecessary minutely to enter upon it again. It may not be out of place to quote a few lines from the work of one of the ablest and most eminent advocates of the general authority of the Acts. Speaking of the speeches of Paul, Lekebusch says:—"The speeches of our Book, in fact, are calculated, perhaps more than anything, to excite doubt regarding its purely historical character. But here everything depends upon an unbiassed judgment. We are sufficiently free from prejudice to make the admission to recent criticism that the speeches are not verbally given as they were originally delivered, but are composed by the author of the Acts of the

[1] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg., p. 13 ff.; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 283; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 226 f.; *Eichhorn*, Einl., ii. p. 36 ff.; *Kähler*, Stud. u. Krit., 1873, p. 492 ff.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 37 ff., 331 f., 335 f.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 19 ff., 218 ff.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 12 f.; *Oertel*, Paulus, p. 69 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette's Apg., p. liii. ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Paulinismus, p. 505 f.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxviii. f.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 199 f.; Hist. Théol. Chrét., ii. p. 7 f.; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 129 ff., 135 f., 156; *Tholuck*, Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 306 f.; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 191 ff.; *De Wette*, Einl., p. 250 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 496 ff. Cf. *Bleek*, Einl., p. 346 f.; *Guericke*, Gesammtg. N. T., p. 275, anm. 6.

Apostles. Schleiermacher, certainly, has confidently asserted their originality. He thinks: 'If the speeches were separately reported they could not but appear just as we find them in the Acts of the Apostles.' But his remarks, however ingenious and acute they may be, do not stand the test of a thorough examination of the individual speeches. No one who impartially compares these, one with another, and particularly their style with the mode of expression of the author in the other sections, can help agreeing with Eichhorn, when, in consonance with his view regarding the uniform character of the Acts, on the grounds quoted, page 14, he ascribes the composition of the speeches to the writer from whom the whole book in all its parts proceeds."[1] To this impartial expression of opinion, Lekebusch adds a note:—"In saying this, it is naturally not suggested that our author simply *invented* the speeches, independently, without any historical intimation whatever as to the substance of the original: the *form* only, which certainly is here very closely connected with the substance, is hereby ascribed to him."[2] Lekebusch then merely goes on to discuss the nature of the author's design in composing these speeches. The reasons given by Eichhorn, which Lekebusch quotes at "page 14," referred to above, had better be added to complete this testimony. After referring to the result of Eichhorn's "very careful examination" of the internal character of Acts, Lekebusch says:—"He finds, however, that, throughout the whole Acts of the Apostles there prevails the same style, the same manner, the same method and mode of expression' (ii. 35). Not

[1] Comp. u. Entst. der Apostelgesch, 1854, p. 331 f.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 332, anm. 1.

even the speeches, which one at first might take for inserted documents, seem to him 'from a strange hand, but elaborated by the same from which the whole book, with its three parts, proceeds.' 'Various peculiarities existing in the speeches' prove this to him, independent of the similarity of the style, and that, 'although they are put into the mouths of different persons, they nevertheless follow one and the same type, make use of one and the same mode of argument, and have so much that is common to them that they thereby prove themselves to be speeches of one and the same writer' (ii. 38). From these circumstances, therefore, it seems to Eichhorn 'in the highest degree probable, that Luke, throughout the whole Acts of the Apostles, writes as an independent author, and apart from all extraneous works.' And in this view he is 'strengthened by the resemblance of the style which runs through the whole Acts of the Apostles, through speeches, letters, and historical sections,' as well as by the fact that, 'through the whole book, in the quotations from the Old Testament, a similar relation prevails between the Greek text of the Septuagint and that of Luke' (ii. 43)."[1] We have thought it well to quote these independent opinions from writers who range themselves amongst the defenders of the historical character of the Acts, rather than to burden our pages with a mass of dry detail in proof of the assertion that the peculiarities of the author pervade all the speeches indifferently, to a degree which renders it obvious that they proceed from his pen.

Without entering into mere linguistic evidence of this, which will be found in the works to which we have

[1] *Lekebusch*, Comp. u. Entst. der Apostelgesch., p. 14 f.

referred,[1] we may point out a few general peculiarities which are worthy of attention. The author introduces the speeches of different persons with the same expression:—"he opened his mouth," or something similar. Philip "opened his mouth" (*ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ*)[2] and addressed the Ethiopian (viii. 35). Peter "opened his mouth (and) said" (*ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα, εἶπεν*), when he delivered his discourse before the baptism of Cornelius (x. 34). Again, he uses it of Paul:—"And when Paul was about to open his mouth (*μέλλοντος ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα*), Gallio said," &c. (xviii. 14). The formula with which the speech of Peter at Pentecost is introduced deserves more attention:—"Peter lifted up his voice and said unto them" (*ἐπῆρεν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπεφθέγξατο αὐτοῖς*) (ii. 14). The verb *ἀποφθέγγεσθαι* occurs again (ii. 4) in the account of the descent of the Holy Spirit and the gift of tongues, and it is put into the mouth of Paul (xxvi. 25) in his reply to Festus, but it occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. The favourite formula with which all speeches open is, "Men (and) Brethren (*ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί*), or *ἄνδρες* coupled with some other term, as "Men (and) Israelites" (*ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται*), or simply *ἄνδρες* without addition. *Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί*, occurs no less than thirteen times. It is used thrice by Peter,[3] six times by Paul,[4] as well as by Stephen,[5] James,[6] the believers at Pentecost,[7] and the

[1] See references, p. 78, note 1, and especially the works of Eichhorn, Credner, Zeller, Mayerhoff, Lekebusch, and Davidson.

[2] It is to be remarked, however, that the same expression occurs in the first Synoptic (Matth. v. 2, xiii. 35, xvii. 27), and only once in Luke i. 64. It is also quoted Acts viii. 32 from the lxx. version of Isaiah liii. 7.

[3] i. 16; ii. 29; xv. 7.

[4] xiii. 26, 38; xxii. 1; xxiii. 1, 6; xxviii. 17.

[5] vii. 2. [6] xv. 13. [7] ii. 37.

rulers of the Synagogue.[1] The angels at the Ascension address the disciples as "Men (and) Galileans" (*ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι*).[2] Peter makes use of *ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται* twice,[3] and it is likewise employed by Paul,[4] by Gamaliel,[5] and by the Jews of Asia.[6] Peter addresses those assembled at Pentecost as *ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι*.[7] Paul opens his Athenian speech with *ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι*,[8] and the town-clerk begins his short appeal to the craftsmen of Ephesus: *ἄνδρες Ἐφέσιοι*.[9] The simple *ἄνδρες* is used indifferently by various speakers.[10] There can be no doubt that the common use of these expressions by all speakers in the Acts betrays the hand of the same composer throughout.[11]

In the speech which Peter is represented as making at Pentecost, he makes an altogether peculiar use (ii. 25—27) of Psalm xvi., which he quotes, in order to prove that the Resurrection of Jesus the Messiah was a necessary occurrence, which had been foretold by David. This is principally based upon the tenth verse of the Psalm: "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt thou give thine Holy One (*τὸν ὅσιόν σου*) to see corruption (*διαφθοράν*)?"[12] Peter argues that David both died and was buried, and that his sepulchre is with them to that day, but that, being a prophet, he foresaw and spake here of the Resurrection of Christ, "that neither was he left in Hades nor did his flesh see corruption (*διαφθοράν*)."[13] Is it not an extremely singular

[1] xiii. 15. [2] i. 11. [3] ii. 22; iii. 12.
[4] xiii. 16. [5] v. 35. [6] xxi. 28.
[7] ii. 14. [8] xvii. 22. [9] xix. 35.
[10] vii. 26; xiv. 15; xix. 25; xxvii. 10, 21, 25.
[11] *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 224 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. ii. p. 42. o
[12] *ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχήν μου εἰς ᾅδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.* Acts ii. 27.
[13] . . . *ὅτι οὔτε ἐγκατελείφθη εἰς ᾅδην οὔτε ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδεν διαφθοράν.* Acts ii. 31.

circumstance that Peter, addressing an audience of Jews in Jerusalem, where he might naturally be expected to make use of the vernacular language, actually quotes the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, and bases his argument upon a mistranslation of the Psalm, which, we may add, was in all probability not composed by David at all?[1] The word translated "Holy One," should be in the plural: "holy ones,"[2] that is to say: "thy saints," and the word rendered διαφθορά corruption, really signifies "grave" or "pit."[3] The poet, in fact, merely expresses his confidence that he will be preserved alive. The best critics recognize that Ps. xvi. is not properly a Messianic Psalm

[1] *Ewald*, Die Psalmen, u. s. w., 1866, p. 237 ff., 246 ff.; *Fürst*, Gesch. bibl. Literatur, 1870, ii. p. 187, anm. 2, p. 392; *Kuenen*, Hist. Krit. Onderzoek naar het Ontstaan des Ouden Verbonds, 1865, iii. p. 281, 294, 295 f., n. 12; *J. Olshausen*, Die Psalmen, 1853, p. 83. Cf. *Bleek*, Einl. A. T., 1865, p. 615 f.; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, 1867, i. p. 396 ff.

[2] *R. Anger*, Gesch. mess. Idee., p. 73; *Ch. Bruston*, Les Psaumes, 1865, p. 23; *Mallet de Chilly*, Les Prophètes, 1862, p. 21; *Davidson*, Int. O. Test., 1862, ii. p. 279; *Ewald*, Die Psalmen, p. 246, 249 f.; *Fischer*, Prolusiones de vitiis Lex. N. T., 1791, p. 184 ff.; *Four Friends*, The Psalms chron. arranged, 1867, p. 202; *Fürst*, Gesch. bibl. Literatur, ii. p. 392; *Hengstenberg*, Die Psalmen, 2te Aufl., i. p. 337 ff.; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 369 ff.; *Kamphausen*, in Bunsen's Bibelw. iii. p. 30; *Kuenen*, De Profeten, ii. p. 241 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 75; *J. Olshausen*, Die Psalmen, p. 83, 89; *Rosenmüller*, Scholia in Vet. Test., Psalmi, i. 1821, p. 394 ff.; *De Wette*, Die Psalmen, p. 197; Die heil. Schr. A. u. N. T. übers., 1858; Apostelg., p. 41. Cf. *Tholuck*, Die Psalmen, 2te Aufl., p. 170, anm. *.

[3] *Ch. Bruston*, Les Psaumes, 1865, p. 23; *Mallet de Chilly*, Les Prophètes, &c., 1862, p. 21; *Davidson*, Int. O. T., ii. 279; *Delitzsch*, Die Psalmen, 3te Aufl., i. p. 156, 164; *Ewald*, Die Psalmen, p. 246, 249 f.; *Fischer*, Prolus. de vitiis Lex. N. T., p. 184 ff.; *Gesenius*, Lex. Hebr. et Chald. in Vet. Test. sub. voce; *Hengstenberg*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 337 ff.; *Hitzig*, Die Psalmen, 1863, i. p. 86; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 396 ff.; *Kamphausen*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iii. p. 30; *Kuenen*, De Profeten, ii. p. 241 f.; *Kuinoel*, Comm. N. T., iv. p. 84; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 75 f.; *J. Olshausen*, Die Psalmen, p. 89; *Rosenmüller*, Scholia in Vet. Test., Psalmi, i. 1821, p. 393 ff.; *De Wette*, Die Psalmen, p. 197; Apg., p. 41. Cf. *Anger*, Gesch. mess. Idee, p. 73; *Grotius*, Annot. N. T., v. p. 17 f.; *Tholuck*, Die Psalmen, p. 170, anm. *.

at all,[1] and many of those who, from the use which is made of it in Acts, are led to assert that it is so, recognize in the main that it can only be applied to the Messiah indirectly, by arguing that the prophecy was not fulfilled in the case of the poet who speaks of himself, but was fulfilled in the Resurrection of Jesus. This reasoning, however, totally ignores the sense of the original, and is opposed to all legitimate historical interpretation of the Psalm. Not dwelling upon this point at present, we must go on to point out that, a little further on (xiii. 35—37), the Apostle Paul is represented as making use of the very same argument which Peter here employs, and quoting the same passage from Ps. xvi. to support it. This repetition of very peculiar reasoning, coupled with other similarities which we shall presently point out, leads to the inference that it is merely the author himself who puts this argument into their mouths,[2] and this conclusion is strengthened by the circumstance that, throughout both Gospel and Acts, he always quotes from the Septuagint,[3] and even when that version departs from

[1] *Anger*, Gesch. mess. Idee, p. 73 f.; *G. Baur*, Gesch. alttest. Weissagung, i. p. 407 ff., 417; *Bleek*, Einl. A. T., p. 624 f.; *Bretschneider*, Lehrb. d. Religion u. d. Gesch. chr. Kirche, 1827, p. 139; *Davidson*, Int. O. T., ii. p. 279 f.; Int. N. T., ii. p. 228; *Ewald*, Die Psalmen, p. 238 f., 245 ff.; *Fürst*, Gesch. bibl. Literatur, ii. p. 187, anm. 2, 392; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 396 ff.; *Kuenen*, De Profeten, ii. p. 249 ff.; *J. Olshausen*, Die Psalmen, p. 83 ff.; *Rosenmüller*, Scholia in V. T., Psalmi, *i.* 1821, p. 363 ff.; *De Wette*, Die Psalmen, p. 192 ff. Cf. *Hengstenberg*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 338 ff., 342.

[2] *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 38 f.; *De Wette*, Apostelgesch., p. liii., p. 204; Einl. N. T., p. 250 f.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 222; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 240; *Schneckenburger*, Zweck der Apg., p. 130. Cf. *Weiss*, Der petr. Lehrbegriff, p. 205, anm. 2.

[3] *Bleek*, Einl., p. 277 f.; *Credner*, Einl., i. p. 273; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 240, 267; *Eichhorn*, Einl., ii. p. 43; *Guericke*, Gesammtg., p. 275 f., anm. 6; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. xxiii.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 78 f., 404 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 12; *Schleiermacher*, Einl., p. 378 f.; *De Wette*, Einl.,

the sense of the original. It may be well to give both passages in juxta-position, in order that the closeness of the analogy may be more easily realized. For this purpose we somewhat alter the order of the verses:—

PETER IN ACTS ii.	PAUL IN ACTS xiii.
25. For David saith concerning him. . . . 27. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt thou give thine holy one to see corruption.	35. Wherefore he (David) saith also in another (Psalm): Thou wilt not give thine holy one to see corruption.
30. Being therefore a prophet, and knowing that God swore with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins[1] he would set one upon his throne,	22. . . . he raised up unto them David for king . . . .
31. He foresaw and spoke of the resurrection of the Christ, that he was neither left in Hades nor did his flesh see corruption (διαφθοράν).	23 Of this man's seed God, according to promise, brought unto Israel a Saviour Jesus.
29. Men (and) brethren I may speak with freedom unto you of the patriarch David, that he both died and was buried, and his sepulchre is amongst us unto this day.	34. But that he raised him up from the dead no more to return to corruption (διαφθοράν) he has said on this wise. . . .
32 This Jesus God raised up.	36. For David, after he served in his own generation the counsel of God, fell asleep, and was added to his fathers and saw corruption (διαφθοράν);
	37. But he whom God raised saw not corruption (διαφθοράν).

Not only is this argument the same in both discourses, but the whole of Paul's speech, xiii. 16 ff., is a mere reproduction of the two speeches of Peter, ii. 14 ff. and iii. 12 ff., with such alterations as the writer could introduce to vary the fundamental sameness of ideas and expressions. It is worth while to show this in a similar way:—

p. 247; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 398. Cf. *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxviii. f., note 6.

[1] The authorised version, with Cod. D, and some other MSS., inserts here: "according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit," &c.

PAUL IN ACTS xiii.	PETER IN ACTS ii. and iii.
16. And Paul having risen . . . (ἀναστὰς δὲ Π.) . . . said . . . Men (and) Israelites (ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται) and ye that fear God . . .	14. And Peter stood up (σταθεὶς δὲ Π.) . . . . and spoke plainly to them . . . Men (and) Jews (ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι) and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem . . . . (verse 22 and iii. 12) Men (and) Israelites (ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται).
22 and 23. See above.	30. See above.
24. When John first preached[1] before his coming the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel.	iii. 19. Repent, therefore, and turn . . . . 20. . . . that he may send Christ Jesus who before was appointed[1] for you.
26. Men (and) Brethren (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί), sons (υἱοὶ) of the race of Abraham and those among you who fear God, to you was the word of this salvation sent (ἀπεστάλη).[3]	ii. 29. Men (and) Brethren (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί).
	iii. 25.[2] Ye are the sons (υἱοί) of the prophets and of the covenant which God made unto your fathers, saying unto Abraham . . . 26 . . . unto you first God, having raised up his servant (τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ),[4] sent (ἀπέστειλεν) him to bless you.
27. For they that dwell in Jerusalem and their rulers (οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν), not knowing (ἀγνοήσαντες) this (man) nor yet the voices of the prophets (τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν), which are read every (πᾶν) sabbath day, fulfilled (ἐπλήρωσαν) them by their judgment of him ;	iii. 17.[5] And now brethren (ἀδελφοί) I know that ye did (it) in ignorance (ἄγνοιαν), as did also your rulers (οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν) ; 18. but the things which God before announced by the mouth of all the prophets (διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν) he thus fulfilled (ἐπλήρωσεν) ;
28. And though having found no cause of death, they desired	iii. 13 . . . . whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence

[1] The authorised version of iii. 20 reads "preached," adopting the same verb προκηρύττειν as in xiii. 24, which is nowhere else used in the N. T. It is fair to say, however, that the evidence is greatly in favour of the reading "προκεχειρισμένον" in iii. 20.

[2] Cf. ii. 39: For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, whomsoever the Lord God shall have called unto him.

[3] ἐξαπεστάλη is the reading of A, B, C, D, ℵ, &c. ; the reading given is that of E, G, H, &c.

[4] Rendered "son" in the authorised vers.

[5] Cf. Acts xvii. 30.

PAUL IN ACTS xiii.	PETER IN ACTS ii. and iii.
(ἠτήσαντο) Pilate that he should be slain (ἀναιρεθῆναι);[1]	of Pilate when he decided to release him;
	(ii. 23. This (man) delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, by the hand of lawless (men) crucifying (him) ye slew (ἀνείλατε).)[1]
	iii. 14. But ye denied the holy and just one, and desired (ἠτήσασθε) a murderer to be granted to you,
29. But when they finished all the things written regarding him, they took him down from the tree and laid him in a sepulchre.	
30. But God raised him from the dead; (ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν).	15. And killed the Prince of life whom God raised from the dead (ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν), whose witnesses (μάρτυρες) we are.
31. . . . who are now his witnesses (μάρτυρες) . . .	
32. And we declare unto you the promise made unto the fathers (πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας),	iii. 25. Ye are the sons of the prophets and of the covenant made unto your fathers (πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν) saying . . .
	26. Unto you first God, having raised up (ἀναστήσας) his servant (παῖδα) Jesus, sent him to bless you, &c.
33. That God has perfectly fulfilled the same unto our children, having raised up (ἀναστήσας) Jesus, as it is written. . . .	ii. 31, 27, 29, 32. See above.
34, 35, 36, 37. See above.	
38. Be it known unto you, therefore, men (and) brethren (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί), that through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins (ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν).	ii. 37. Men (and) Brethren (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί).
	38. . . . Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for remission of your sins (ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν), &c.
39. And from all things from which ye could not be justified in the law of Moses, every one who believes in this man is justified;	iii. 22. Moses indeed said[2]: A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you.
40. Beware, therefore, lest that	23. And it shall be that every

[1] This verb ἀναιρεῖν is used twice in Luke, only thrice in the rest of the N. T., but nineteen times in Acts, and it is freely put into the mouths of Peter, Paul, Stephen, and Gamaliel, as well as used in the narrative portions.

[2] This reference is also put into the mouth of Stephen, Acts vii. 37.

Paul in Acts xiii.	Peter in Acts ii. and iii.
come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets;	soul which will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed from among the people.
41 Behold ye despisers, and wonder and perish.	24. And all the prophets also from Samuel and from those that follow after, as many as spake, also foretold these days.

Paul's address likewise bears close analogy with the speech of Stephen, vii. 2 ff., commencing with a historical survey of the earlier traditions of the people of Israel, and leading up to the same accusation that, as their fathers disregarded the prophets, so they had persecuted and slain the Christ. The whole treatment of the subject betrays the work of the same mind in both discourses. Bleek, who admits the similarity between these and other speeches in Acts, argues that: "it does not absolutely follow from this that these speeches are composed by one and the same person, and are altogether unhistorical;" for it is natural, he thinks, that in the apostolical circle, and in the first Christian Church, there should have existed a certain uniform type in the application of messianic passages of the Old Testament, and in quotations generally, to which different teachers might conform without being dependent on each other.[1] He thinks also that, along with the close analogy, there is also much which is characteristic in the different speeches. Not only is this typical system of quotation, however, a mere conjecture to explain an actual difficulty, but it is totally inadequate to account for the phenomena. If we suppose, for instance, that Paul had adopted the totally unhistorical application of the sixteenth Psalm to the Messiah, is it not a very extraordinary thing that in all the arguments in his

[1] *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 346; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 195.

Epistles, he does not once refer to it? Even if this be waived, and it be assumed that he had adopted this interpretation of the Psalm, it will scarcely be asserted that Paul, whose independence and originality of mind are so undeniable, and whose intercourse with the apostolical circle at any time, and most certainly up to the period when this speech was delivered, was very limited,[1] could so completely have caught the style and copied the manner of Peter that, on an important occasion like this, his address should be a mere reproduction of Peter's two speeches delivered so long before, and when Paul certainly was not present. The similarity of these discourses does not consist in the mere application of the same Psalm, but the whole argument, on each occasion, is repeated with merely sufficient transposition of its various parts to give a superficial appearance of variety. Words and expressions, rare or unknown elsewhere, are found in both, and the characteristic differences which Bleek finds exist only in his own apologetic imagination. Let it be remembered that the form of the speeches and the language are generally ascribed to the Author of the Acts. Can any unprejudiced critic deny that the ideas in the speeches we are considering are also substantially the same? Is there any appreciable trace of the originality of Paul in his discourses? There is no ground whatever, apart from the antecedent belief that the various speeches were actually delivered by the men to whom they are ascribed, for asserting that we have here the independent utterances of Peter and Paul. It is internal evidence alone, and no avowal on the part of the author, which leads to the conclusion that the form of the speeches is the author's, and there is no internal evidence

[1] Cf. Gal. i. 11 ff., ii. 6.

which requires us to stop at the mere form, and not equally ascribe the substance to the same source. The speeches in the Acts, generally, have altogether the character of being the composition of one mind endeavouring to impart variety of thought and expression to various speakers, but failing signally from poverty of invention on the one hand, and from the purpose of instituting a close parallel in views, as well as actions, between the two representative Apostles.

Further to illustrate this, let us take another speech of Peter which he delivers on the occasion of the conversion of Cornelius, and it will be apparent that it also contains all the elements, so far as it goes, of Paul's discourse.

Peter in Acts x.	Paul in Acts xiii.
35. But in every nation he that fears him (ὁ φοβούμενος) . . . is acceptable to him—	26. Sons (υἱοὶ) of the race of Abraham, and those among you who fear God (οἱ φοβούμενοι), to you was the word (ὁ λόγος) of this salvation sent (ἀπεστάλη).[1]
36. The word (τὸν λόγον) which he (God) sent (ἀπέστειλεν) unto the sons (υἱοῖς) of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ;[2] he is Lord of all.	
37. Ye know the word spoken throughout all Judæa, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism (βάπτισμα) which John preached,	24. When John first proclaimed before his coming the baptism (βάπτισμα) of repentance to all the people of Israel.
38. Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, how God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him.	25. And as John was fulfilling his course, he said: Whom think ye that I am? I am not he; but behold there comes one after me the shoes of whose feet I am not worthy to loose.
39. And we are witnesses (μάρτυρες) of all things which he did both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem; whom also they slew (ἀνεῖλαν), hanging him upon a tree (ξύλου).	27. For they that dwell in Jerusalem and their rulers . . . . 28. Though having found no cause of death, desired Pilate that he should be slain (ἀναιρεθῆναι); 29. But when they had finished all the things written regarding him they took him down from the tree (ξύλου). . .

[1] See p. 86, note 3.

[2] Cf. xiii. 23.

PETER IN ACTS x.	PAUL IN ACTS xiii.
40. Him God raised (ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν) the third day, and gave him to become manifest;	30. But God raised (ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν) him from the dead (ἐκ νεκρῶν);
41. Not to all the people, but to witnesses (μάρτυσιν) chosen before by God, even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead (ἐκ νεκρῶν).	31. And he appeared for many days to those who came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now his witnesses (μάρτυρες) unto the people.
42. And he commanded (παρήγγειλεν) us to preach unto the people and to testify that it is he who has been appointed (ὁ ὡρισμένος)[1] by God judge (κριτὴς) of quick and dead.	xvii. 30. . . . but now commands (παραγγέλλει) all men everywhere to repent; 31. Because he fixed a day in the which he is about to judge (κρίνειν) the world in righteousness by the man whom he appointed (ὥρισεν),[1] having given assurance to all by having raised him up from the dead.
43. To him bear all the prophets witness that through his name all who believe in him shall receive remission of sins (ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν).	xiii. 27. . . . . not knowing the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day. . . . 38. Be it known to you, therefore, ... that through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins (ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν).

Again, to take an example from another speaker, we find James represented as using an expression which had just before been put into the mouth of Paul, and it is not one in the least degree likely to occur independently to each. The two passages are as follows :—

JAMES IN ACTS xv. 21.	PAUL IN xiii. 27.
Moses . . . . being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day. (κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος.)	. . . the prophets being read every Sabbath day. (κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας.)

The fundamental similarity between these different speeches cannot possibly be denied;[2] and it cannot be

[1] Except by the author of Luke (xxii. 22) and Acts, the verb ὁρίζειν is only twice used in the N. T. In Acts it is twice put into the mouth of Peter (ii. 23, x. 42) and twice into that of Paul (xvii. 26, 31), as well as used in narrative (xi. 29).

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 115 ff.; K. G. i. p. 127; *Br. Bauer*, Apg.,

reasonably explained in any other way than by the fact that they were composed by the author himself, who had the earlier speeches of Peter still in his memory when he wrote those of Paul,[1] and who, in short, had not sufficient dramatic power to create altogether distinct characters, but simply made his different personages use his own vocabulary to express his own somewhat limited range of ideas. Setting his special design aside, his inventive faculty only permitted him to represent Peter speaking like Paul, and Paul like Peter.

It is argued by some, however, that in the speeches of Peter, for instance, there are peculiarities of language and expression which show analogy with the first Epistle bearing his name in the New Testament Canon,[2] and, on the other hand, traces of translation in some of them which indicate that these speeches were delivered originally in Aramaic, and that we have only a version of them by the Author of the Acts, or by some one from whom he derived them.[3] As regards the first of these suppositions, a few phrases only have been pointed out, but they are of no force under any circumstances, and the whole theory is quite groundless.[4] We do not con-

p. 78 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 230 ff.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 225 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 130 f.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 540; *De Wette*, Apg., p. liii.; Einl. N. T., p. 250; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 301 ff., 497 f.

[1] *Zeller*, Apg., p. 405 f.

[2] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. Proleg., p. 10; *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 683 f.; *Lange*, Das apost. Zeit., i. p. 108; *Riehm*, De Fontibus Act. Apost., 1821, p. 126 ff., 143 ff.; *Seyler*, Stud. u. Krit., 1832, p. 53 ff.; *Tholuck*, Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 306; *Weiss*, Der petr. Lehrbegriff, 1855, p. 5 f., p. 144 ff. Cf. *Kähler*, Stud. u. Krit., 1873, p. 492 ff., 535 f.

[3] *Bleek*, Einl. p. 348 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 73.

[4] *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 237 f.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 220 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette's Apg., p. liv. f.; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 251; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 496 ff. Cf. *Kähler*, Stud. u. Krit., p. 1873, p. 535 f.

sider it worth while to enter upon the discussion, and those who desire to do so are referred to the works just indicated. There are two potent reasons which render such an argument of no force, even if the supposed analogies were in themselves both numerous and striking, which actually they are not. The authenticity of the Epistles bearing the name of Peter is not only not established, but is by very many eminent critics absolutely denied; and there is no certainty whatever that any of the speeches of Peter were delivered in Greek, and the probability is that most, if not all, of that Apostle's genuine discourses must have been spoken in Aramaic. It is in fact asserted by apologists that part or all of the speeches ascribed to him in the Acts must have been originally Aramaic, although opinion may differ as to the language in which some of them were spoken. Whether they were delivered in Aramaic, or whether there be uncertainty on the point, any conclusion from linguistic analogies with the Epistles is obviously excluded. One thing is quite undeniable: the supposed analogies are few, and the peculiarities distinguishing the Author of Acts in these speeches are extremely numerous and general. Even so thorough an apologist as Tholuck candidly acknowledges that the attempt to prove the authenticity of the speeches from linguistic analogies is hopeless. He says: "Nevertheless, a comparison of the language of the Apostles in their Epistles and in these speeches must in many respects be less admissible than that of the *character* and *historical circumstances*, for indeed if the language and their peculiarities be compared, it must first be established that all the reported speeches were delivered in the Greek language, which is improbable, and of one of which (xxii. 1, 2) the contrary is expressly

stated. Willingly admitting that upon this point difference of opinion is allowable, we express as the view which we have hitherto held that, from ch. xx. onwards, the speeches delivered by Paul are reported more in the language of Luke than in that of Paul."[1] This applies with double force to Peter,[2] whose speeches there is still greater reason to believe were delivered in Aramaic, and there is difference of opinion amongst the critics we have referred to even as to whether these speeches were translated by the Author of the Acts, or were already before him in a translated form, and were subsequently re-edited by him. We have already shown cause for believing that the whole discussion is groundless, from the fact that the speeches in Acts were simply composed by the author himself, and are not in any sense historical, and this we shall hereafter further illustrate.

It may be worth while to consider briefly the arguments advanced for the theory that some of the speeches show marks of translation. It is asserted that the speech of Peter at Pentecost, ii. 14 ff., was delivered in Aramaic.[3] Of course it will be understood that we might

[1] Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 306.

[2] Kähler, after a very exhaustive analysis of the speeches of Peter in Acts, says: "Finally, a possible misunderstanding must be removed. The analogy of the speeches with 1 Peter, and even 2 Peter, is repeatedly referred to; this is not done in the sense that the proof of a Petrine Greek in these speeches could be attempted. If these be regarded at all as true reproductions of historical originals, they were at all events delivered in Aramaic; only in the case of the speech at Cæsarea an exception would perhaps have to be made. Thus, in any case, our text is based upon a translation, which one could not well trace back to the Apostle himself. But only in that case could the proof referred to have any weight." Stud. u. Krit., 1873, p. 535.

[3] *Bleek*, Einl. N. T., p. 348; *Ebrard*, zu Olshausen, Apostelgesch., p. 59 f., cf. Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 684; *Meyer*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 73; *Weiss*, Die petr. Lehrb., p. 205, anm. 3. Ebrard, in his note to Olshausen, considers that the author had the speech already in a trans-

be quite prepared to agree to this statement as applied to a speech actually delivered by Peter; but the assertion, so far as the speeches in Acts are concerned, is based upon what we believe to be the erroneous supposition that they are genuine reports of discourses. On the contrary, we maintain that these speeches are mere compositions by the author of the work. The contention is, however, that the speech attributed to Peter is the translation of a speech originally delivered in Aramaic. In ii. 24, Peter is represented as saying: "Whom God raised up having loosed the pains of death (λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου), because it is not possible that he should be held (κρατεῖσθαι) by it." It is argued by Bleek and others[1] that, as the context proves, the image intended here was evidently the "snares" or "cords" of death, a meaning which is not rendered by the Greek word ὠδῖνες. The confusion is explained, they contend, when it is supposed that, in his Aramaic speech, Peter made use of a Hebrew expression, equally found in Aramaic, which means as well "snares" or "cords" as "pains" of death. The Greek translator, probably misled by the Septuagint,[2] adopted the latter signification of the Hebrew word in question, and rendered it ὠδῖνες "pains," which is absolutely inappropriate, for, they argue, it is very unnatural to say of one who had already suffered death, like Christ, that he had been held prisoner by the "*pains*" of death, and loosed from them by the resurrection. There is, however, very little unanimity

lated form, or an account of it, before him, but in his own work he declares for its having been delivered in Greek.

[1] *Bleek*, Einl., p. 348; Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1038 f. Cf. *Meyer*, Apg., p. 72 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 22, anm. 1; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. 20.

[2] Ps. xvii. 5 (A. V. xviii. 5).

amongst apologists about this passage. Ebrard[1] asserts that ὠδῖνες "pains" is the correct translation of the Hebrew expression, as in Ps. xviii. 5, and that the Hebrew word used always expresses pains of birth, the plural of the similar word for "cord" or "snare" being different. Ebrard, therefore, contends that the Psalm (xviii. 5) does not mean bonds or snares of death but literally "birth-pains of death," by which the soul is freed from the natural earthly existence as by a second birth to a glorified spiritual life. We need not enter further into the discussion of the passage, but it is obvious that it is mere assumption to assert, on the one hand, that Peter made use of any specific expression, and, on the other, that there was any error of translation on the part of the author of Acts. But agreeing that the Hebrew is erroneously rendered,[2] the only pertinent question is: by whom was the error in question committed? and the reply beyond any doubt is: by the LXX. who translate the Hebrew expression in this very way. It is therefore inadmissible to assert from this phrase the existence of an Aramaic original of the speech, for the phrase itself is nothing but a quotation from the Septuagint.[3]

The expression ὠδῖνες θανάτου occurs no less than three times in that version: Ps. xvii. 5 (A. V. xviii.), cxiv. 3 (A. V. cxvi.) and 2 Sam. xxii. 6; and in Job

[1] *Ebrard*, zu Olshausen, Apg., p. 63.

[2] *Bleek*, Einl., p. 348; Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1038 f.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 404 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 72 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 22, anm. 1; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette, Apg., p. 40; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 39 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 502 f. Cf. *Delitzsch*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 182; *Ewald*, Die Psalmen, p. 56 f.; *Hengstenberg*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 394 f.; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 455; *Gesenius*, Lexicon, s. v.

[3] *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 502 f.; *Lekebusch*, Die Comp. u. Entst. d. Apostelgesch., p. 404 f. Cf. *Kähler*, Stud. u. Krit., 1873, p. 571.

xxxix. 2, we have λύειν used with ὠδῖνες: ὠδῖνας δὲ αὐτῶν ἔλυσας. When it is remembered that the author of Acts always quotes the Septuagint version, even when it departs from the sense of the Hebrew original, and in all probability was only acquainted with the Old Testament through it, nothing is more natural than the use of this expression taken from that version, but with the error already existing there, to ascribe it afresh and independently to the Author of Acts, upon no other grounds than the assumption that Peter may have spoken in Aramaic, and used an expression which the author misunderstood or wrongly rendered, is not permissible. Indeed, we have already pointed out that, in this very speech, there are quotations of the Old Testament according to the LXX. put into the mouth of Peter, in which that version does not accurately render the original.[1]

The next trace of translation advanced by Bleek[2] is found in ii. 33,[3] where Peter speaks of Christ as exalted: "τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ." There can be no doubt, Bleek argues, that there is here a reference to Psalm cx. 1, and that the apostle intends to speak of Christ's elevation "*to* the right (hand) of God;" whereas the Greek expression rather conveys the interpretation: "*by* the right (hand) of God." This expression certainly comes, he asserts, from a not altogether suitable translation of the Hebrew. To this on the other hand, much may be objected. Winer,[4] followed by others, defends the construction, and affirms that the passage may without

[1] Acts ii. 16 ff., 26, 27.

[2] Einl. N. T., p. 348; Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1038; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 42; *Weiss*, Petr. Lehrb., p. 205.

[3] Cf. Acts v. 31.

[4] Grammat. N. T. Sprachid., 1867, § 31, 5, p. 201.

hesitation, be translated "*to* the right (hand) of God."[1] In which case there is no error at all, and the argument falls to the ground. If it be taken, however, either that the rendering should be or was intended to be "by the right (hand) of God"[2] *i.e.*, by the power of God, that would not involve the necessity of admitting an Aramaic original,[3] because there is no error at all, and the argument simply is, that being exalted by the right hand of God, Jesus had poured forth the Holy Spirit; and in the next verse the passage in Ps. cx. 1 (Sept. cix.) is accurately quoted from the Septuagint version: "Sit thou on my right (hand)" (ἐκ δεξιῶν μου). In fact, after giving an account of the crucifixion, death, and resurrection of Jesus, the speaker ascribes his subsequent exaltation to the power of God.[4]

We have seen that at least the form of the speeches in Acts is undoubtedly due to the author of the book, and that he has not been able to make the speeches of the different personages in his drama differ materially from each other. We shall hereafter have occasion to examine further the contents of some of these speeches, and the circumstances under which it is alleged that they were spoken, and to inquire whether these do not confirm

[1] *Winer*, l. c.; *Lekebusch*, Apostelgesch., p. 405; *Kähler*, Stud. u. Kr., 1873, p. 511 f.; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test., Acts, p. 49; *Hackett*, Acts, p. 51; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 66; *Fritzsche*, Conject., i. p. 42.

[2] *Meyer*, Apg., p. 77 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 42; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 21, anm. 1; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 502, anm. 2; *Bengel*, Gnom. N. T., p. 511; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 26. "By" is adopted by the Vulgate, Syriac, Arabic, and English (authorised) versions.

[3] *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 405; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 77 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 42; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 502 f., anm. 2; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 26. Cf. *Kähler*, Stud. u. Krit., 1873, p. 511 f.

[4] The expression τῇ δεξιᾷ is used in this sense in the Sept. version of Isaiah lxiii. 12; cf. Acts v. 31. The "right hand of God," as symbolising his power, is constantly employed in the Old Testament.

the conclusion hitherto arrived at, that they are not historical, but merely the free composition of the Author of Acts, and never delivered at all. Before passing on, however, it may be well to glance for a moment at one of these speeches, to which we may not have another opportunity of referring, in order that we may see whether it presents any traces of inauthenticity and of merely ideal composition.

In the first chapter an account is given of a meeting of the brethren in order to elect a successor to the traitor Judas. Peter addresses the assembly, i. 16 ff., and it may be well to quote the opening portion of his speech: 16. "Men (and) brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, who became guide to them that took Jesus, 17. because he was numbered with us and obtained the lot of this ministry. 18. Now (μὲν οὖν) this man purchased a field with the wages of the iniquity (ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας), and falling headlong he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out; 19. and (καὶ) it became known[1] unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem, so that that field was called in their own tongue (τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ) Acheldamach, that is: field of blood. 20. For (γὰρ) it is written in the book of Psalms: 'Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein,' and 'his office let another take,'" &c., &c. Now let it be remembered that Peter is supposed to be addressing an audience of Jews in Jerusalem, in the Hebrew or Aramaic language, a few

[1] The peculiar and favourite expression, γνωστὸν ἐγένετο (or ἔστω) ὑμῖν, which only occurs in Acts, is placed in the mouth of Peter, Paul, and others, and itself betrays the hand of the author. Cf. ii. 14, iv. 10, ix. 42, xiii. 38, xix. 17, xxviii. 22, 28.

weeks after the crucifixion. Is it possible, therefore, that he should give such an account as that in vs. 18, 19, of the end of Judas, which he himself, indeed, says was known to all the dwellers at Jerusalem? Is it possible that, speaking in Aramaic to Jews, probably in most part living at and near Jerusalem, he could have spoken of the field being so called by the people of Jerusalem "in their own tongue?" Is it possible that he should, to such an audience, have translated the word Acheldamach? The answer of most unprejudiced critics is that Peter could not have done so.[1] As de Wette remarks: "In the composition of this speech the author has not considered historical decorum."[2] This is felt by most apologists, and many ingenious theories are advanced to explain away the difficulty. Some affirm that verses 18 and 19 are inserted as a parenthesis by the Author of the Acts,[3] whilst a larger number contend that only v. 19 is parenthetic.[4] A very cursory examination of the passage, however, is sufficient to show that the verses cannot be separated. Verse 18 is connected with the preceding by the μὲν οὖν, 19 with 18 by καὶ, and verse 20 refers to 16, as indeed it also does to 17 and 18, without which the passage from the Psalm, as applied to Judas, would be unintelligible. Most critics, therefore,

[1] *Credner*, Einl., i. p. 283; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 226 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 384 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 335 f.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 225 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette's Apg., p. 12 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 510; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 97, anm. 1; *De Wette*, Einl., p. 250; Apg., p. 12; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 79 ff.

[2] Apostelg., p. 12.

[3] *Beelen*, Comm. Act. Apost., p. 35 f.; *Hackett*, Acts, p. 9 f.; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. 9 f.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl., p. 372. Cf. *Robinson*, Acts, p. 5.

[4] *Ebrard*, zu Olshausen, Apg., p. 39; *Kuinoel*, Comm. N. T., iv. p. 18.

are agreed that none of the verses can be considered parenthetic.[1] Some apologists, however, who feel that neither of the obnoxious verses can be thus explained, endeavour to overcome the difficulty by asserting that the words: "in their own tongue" (τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ) and: "that is: the field of blood" (τοῦτ' ἔστιν χωρίον αἵματος) in verse 19, are merely explanatory and inserted by the Author of Acts.[2] It is unnecessary to say that this explanation is purely arbitrary, and that there is no ground, except the difficulty itself, upon which their exclusion from the speech can be based. In the cases to which we have hitherto referred, the impossibility of supposing that Peter could have spoken in this way has led writers to lay the responsibility of unacknowledged interpolations in the speech of the Apostle upon the Author of Acts, thus at once relieving Peter. There are some apologists, however, who do not resort to this expedient, but attempt to meet the difficulty in other ways, while accepting the whole as a speech of Peter. According to one theory, those who object that Peter could not have thus related the death of Judas to people who must already have been well acquainted with the circumstances have totally overlooked the fact, that a peculiar view of what has occurred is taken in the narrative, and that this peculiar view is the principal point of it. According to the statement made, Judas met his miserable end in the very field which he had bought with

[1] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 8 f.; *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 31 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 226 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 384 ff.; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 225 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 38 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 12 f.; *Stier*, Die Reden der Apostel, 2te Aufl., i. p. 8; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 12 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 79 ff.

[2] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 9 f.; *Bengel*, Gnom. N. T., p. 503; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 39; *Stier*, Die Reden der Apostel, p. 8.

the price of blood. It is this circumstance, it appears, which Peter brings prominently forward and represents as a manifest and tangible dispensation of Divine justice.[1] Unfortunately, however, this is clearly an imaginary moral attached to the narrative by the apologist, and is not the object of the supposed speaker, who rather desires to justify the forced application to Judas of the quotations in verse 20, which are directly connected with the preceding by γὰρ. Moreover, no explanation is here offered of the extraordinary expressions in verse 19 addressed to citizens of Jerusalem by a Jew in their own tongue. Another explanation, which includes these points, is still more striking. With regard to the improbability of Peter's relating, in such a way, the death of Judas, it is argued that, according to the Evangelists, the disciples, some eight days after the resurrection, went from Jerusalem back to Galilee, and only returned, earlier than usual, before Pentecost to await the fulfilment of the promise of Jesus. Peter and his companions, therefore, it is argued, only after their return became acquainted with the fate of Judas, which had taken place during their absence, and the matter was, therefore, quite new to them; besides, it is added, a speaker is often obliged on account of some connection with his subject to relate facts already known.[2] It is true that some of the Evangelists represent this return to Galilee[3] as having taken place, but the author of the third Gospel and the Acts not only

[1] *Baumgarten*, Die Apostelgesch., 1859, p. 31 f.

[2] *Lange*, Das Apost. Zeitalter, i. 85, ii. p. 16.

[3] Mt. xxviii. 10, 16; Mk. xvi. 7; John xxi. 1. Dr. Farrar, somewhat pertinently, asks: "Why did they (the disciples) not go to Galilee immediately on receiving our Lord's message? The circumstance is unexplained. . . Perhaps the *entire* message of Jesus to them is not recorded; perhaps they awaited the end of the feast." Life of Christ, ii. p. 441, note 1.

does not do so but excludes it.[1] In the third Gospel (xxiv. 49), Jesus commands the disciples to remain in Jerusalem until they are endued with power from on high, and then, after blessing them, he is parted from them, and they return from Bethany to Jerusalem.[2] In Acts, the author again takes up the theme, and whilst evidently giving later traditions regarding the appearances after the resurrection, he adheres to his version of the story regarding the command to stay in Jerusalem. In i. 4, he he says: "And being assembled together with them he commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father," etc.; and here again, verse 12, the disciples are represented, just before Peter's speech is supposed to have been delivered, as returning from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem. The Author of Acts and of the third Synoptic, therefore, gives no countenance to this theory. Besides, setting all this aside, the apologetic hypothesis we are discussing is quite excluded upon other grounds. If we suppose that the disciples did go into Galilee for a time, we find them again in Jerusalem at the election of the successor to Judas, and there is no ground for believing that they had only just returned. The Acts not only allow of no interval at all for the journey to Galilee between i. 12-14 and 15 ff., but by the simple statement

[1] In Luke xxiv. 49 the Cod. Alex. reads ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἱερουσαλήμ, with Cod. C * *, F, H, K, M, and a number of others of less note. The other older Codices omit Ἱερουσαλήμ, but there is no difference of opinion that the "city" is Jerusalem.

[2] We shall hereafter have to go more fully into this, and shall not discuss it here. The third Gospel really represents the Ascension as taking place on the day of the Resurrection; and Acts, whilst giving later tradition, and making the Ascension occur forty days after, does not amend, but confirms the previously enunciated view that the disciples had been ordered to stay in Jerusalem.

with which our episode commences, v. 15: "And in these days" (καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις), Peter conveys anything but the impression of any very recent return to Jerusalem. If the Apostles had been even a few days there, the incongruity of the speech would remain undiminished; for the 120 brethren who are said to have been present must chiefly have been residents in Jerusalem, and cannot be supposed also to have been absent, and, in any case, events which are stated to have been so well known to all the dwellers in Jerusalem, must have been well known to the whole of the small Christian community, whose interest in the matter was so specially great. Moreover, according to the first Synoptic, as soon as Judas sees that Jesus is condemned, he brings the money back to the chief priests, casts it down and goes and hangs himself, xxvii. 3 ff. This is related even before the final condemnation of Jesus to death and before his crucifixion, and the reader is led to believe that Judas at once put an end to himself, so that the disciples who are represented as being still in Jerusalem for at least eight days after the resurrection must have been there at the time. With regard to the singular expressions in verse 19, this theory goes on to suppose that out of consideration for Greek fellow-believers Peter had probably already begun to speak in the Greek tongue, and when he designates the language of the dwellers in Jerusalem as "their own dialect," he does not thereby mean Hebrew in itself, but their own expression, the peculiar confession of the opposite party which admitted the cruel treachery towards Jesus, in that they named the piece of ground Hakel Damah.[1] Here, again, what assumptions! Most critics recognize that Peter must have spoken in Ara-

[1] *Lange*, Das apost. Zeit., i. p. 85 f., ii. 16.

maic, and even if he did not, τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ[1] cannot mean anything but the language of "all the dwellers at Jerusalem." In a speech at Jerusalem delivered in any language, to an audience consisting at least in considerable part of inhabitants of the place, and certainly almost entirely of persons whose native tongue was Aramaic, to tell them that the inhabitants called a certain field "in their own tongue" Acheldamach, giving them at the same time a translation of the word, is inconceivable to most critics, even including apologists, as we have already pointed out.

There is another point which indicates not only that this theory is inadequate to solve the difficulty, but that the speech could not have been delivered by Peter a few weeks after the occurences related. It is stated that the circumstances narrated were so well known to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, that the field was called in their own tongue Acheldamach. The origin of this name is not ascribed to the priests or rulers, but to the people, and it is not to be supposed that a popular name could have become attached to this field, and so generally adopted as the text represents, within the very short time which could have elapsed between the death of Judas and the delivery of this speech. Be it remembered that from the time of the crucifixion to Pentecost the interval was in all only about seven weeks, and that this speech was made some time before Pentecost, how long we cannot tell, but in any case, the interval was much too brief to permit of the popular adoption of the name.[2] The whole passage has much more the character of a narrative of

[1] διάλεκτος is used six times in Acts, and nowhere else in the New Testament; τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ occurs thrice, i. 19, ii. 6, 8; and τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ thrice, xxi. 40, xxii. 2, xxvi. 14.

[2] *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., ii. p. 36 f.

events which had occurred at a time long past, than of circumstances which had taken place a few days before.

The obvious conclusion is that this speech was never spoken by Peter, but is a much later composition put into his mouth,[1] and written for Greek readers, who required to be told about Judas, and for whose benefit the Hebrew name of the field, inserted for local colouring, had to be translated. This is confirmed by several circumstances, to which we may refer. We shall not dwell much upon the fact that Peter is represented as applying to Judas two passages quoted from the Septuagint version of Ps. lxix. 25 (Sept. lxviii.) and Ps. cix. (Sept. cviii.) which, historically, cannot for a moment be sustained as referring to him.[2] The first of these Psalms is quoted freely, and moreover the denunciations in the original being against a plurality of enemies, it can only be made applicable to Judas by altering the plural "their" (αὐτῶν) to "his habitation" (ἔπαυλις αὐτοῦ), a considerable liberty to take with prophecy. The Holy Ghost is said to have

[1] *Eichhorn*, Einl., ii. p. 36 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 384 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 336; *Mayerhoff*, Einl. petr. Schr., p. 225 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 97, anm. 1; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 79 ff.

[2] *Davidson*, Int. O. T., ii. p. 302; Int. N. T., ii. p. 227; *Ewald*, Die Psalmen, p. 292 ff.; *Hitzig*, Die Psalmen, 1864, ii. 1. p. 93 ff.; ii. 2. 1865, p. 314; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, ed. Riehm, 1870, iii. p. 260 f.; iv., 1871, p. 172 ff.; *Kamphausen* in Bunsen's Bibelw. iii. p. 138 f. 217 f.; *Kuenen*, Hist. krit. Onderzoek, O. V., 1865, iii. p. 299; De Profeten, p. 237 ff., 252 f.; *J. Olshausen*, Die Psalmen, 1853, p. 297 ff., 417 ff.; *Rosenmüller*, Scholia in V. T., Psalmi, 1823, iii. p. 1295, 1646 ff.; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 12; Comm. üb. die Psalmen, p. 386 f., 466 ff.; *Four Friends*, The Psalms, p. 227, 232. Cf. *G. Baur*, Gesch. alttest. Weissagung, p. 416; *Bleek*, Einl. A. Test., p. 625; *Delitzsch*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 487; *Hengstenberg*, Die Psalmen, iii. p. 240, iv. p. 209 ff.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 40; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 39 f.; *Stier*, Die Reden der Apost., i. p. 4. It is scarcely maintained by any reasonable critic that the supposed prophecies had immediate or direct bearing upon Judas. They can only be applied to him secondarily, and by forcing the historical sense.

spoken this prophecy "concerning Judas" "by the mouth of David," but modern research has led critics to hold it as most probable that neither Ps. lxix.[1] nor Ps. cix.[2] was composed by David at all. As we know nothing of Peter's usual system of exegesis, however, very little weight as evidence can be attached to this. On the other hand, it is clear that a considerable time must have elapsed before these two passages from the Psalms could have become applied to the death of Judas.[3]

The account which is given of the fate of Judas is contradictory to that given in the first Synoptic and cannot be reconciled with it, but follows a different tradition.[4] According to the first Synoptic (xxvii. 3 ff.), Judas brings back the thirty pieces of silver, casts them down in the Temple, and then goes and hangs himself. The chief priests take the money and buy with it the Potter's field, which is not said to have had any other connection with Judas, as a place for the burial of strangers. In the Acts, Judas himself buys a field as a private possession, and instead

[1] *Davidson*, Int. O. T., ii. p. 302; *Delitzsch*, Die Psalmen, i. p. 485 f.; *Ewald*, Die Psalmen, p. 292; *Fürst*, Gesch. bibl. Literatur, ii. 1870, p. 130, anm. 4; *Four Friends*, The Psalms, p. 227; *Hitzig*, Die Psalmen, 1864, ii. p. 93 f.; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, iii. p. 259 f.; *Kamphausen*, in Bunsen's Bibelw. iii. p. 138; *Kuenen*, Hist. kr. Onderzoek, iii. p. 294, 299; *J. Olshausen*, Die Psalmen, p. 298; *Rosenmüller*, Scholia in V. T., Psalmi, iii. p. 1295 f.; *De Wette*, Einl. A. T., p. 362.

[2] *Davidson*, Int. O. T., ii. p. 302; *Ewald*, Die Psalmen, p. 298 f.; *Fürst*, Gesch. bibl. Lit., ii. p. 130, anm. 4; *Four Friends*, The Psalms, p. 232; *Hitzig*, Die Psalmen, ii. p. 312 f.; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, iv. p. 175; *Kuenen*, Hist. kr. Onderzoek, iii. p. 285; *J. Olshausen*, Die Psalmen, p. 417; *De Wette*, Einl. A. T., p. 362; Die Psalmen, p. 466. Cf. *Delitzsch*, Die Psalmen, ii. p. 194.

[3] *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 385.

[4] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 8 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 385 f.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iv. p. 287; viii. p. 335; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 13; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 510; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 13; *Winer*, Realwörterb. s. v. "Blutacker," i. p. 88; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 80 f. Cf. *Meyer*, Apg., p. 38 f.

of committing suicide by hanging, he is represented as dying from a fall in this field, which is evidently regarded as a special judgment upon him for his crime. The apologetic attempts to reconcile these two narratives,[1] are truly lamentable. Beyond calling attention to this amongst other phenomena presented in this speech, however, we have not further to do with the point at present. We have already devoted too much space to Peter's first address, and we now pass on to more important topics.

[1] *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 31 f.; *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 543 f.; *Guericke*, Beiträge, p. 88 f.; *Hackett*, On Acts, p. 32; *Humphrey*, On Acts, p. 10; *Lange*, Das ap. Z., i. p. 85 f.; ii. p. 16 f.; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test., Acts, p. 40 f. The usual apologetic mode of reconciling the contradictions regarding the manner of death is by supposing that the rope by which Judas hung himself, according to the Gospel, broke, and, in his fall, the occurrence ensued which is related in the Acts.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

We now enter upon a portion of our examination of the Acts which is so full of interest in itself that peculiar care will be requisite to restrain ourselves within necessary limits. Hitherto our attention has been mainly confined to the internal phenomena presented by the document before us, with comparatively little aid from external testimony, and although the results of such criticism have been of no equivocal character, the historical veracity of the Acts has not yet been tested by direct comparison with other sources of information. We now propose to examine, as briefly as may be, some of the historical statements in themselves, and by the light of information derived from contemporary witnesses of unimpeachable authority, and to confront them with well-established facts in the annals of the first two centuries. This leads us to the borders not only of one of the greatest controversies which has for half a century occupied theological criticism, but also of still more important questions regarding the original character and systematic development of Christianity itself. The latter we must here resolutely pass almost unnoticed, and into the former we shall only enter so far as is absolutely necessary to the special object of our inquiry. The document before us professes to give a narrative of the progress of the

primitive Church from its first formation in the midst of Mosaism, with strong Judaistic rules and prejudices, up to that liberal universalism which freely admitted the christian Gentile, upon equal terms, into communion with the christian Jew. The question with which we are concerned is strictly this: Is the account in the Acts of the Apostles of the successive steps by which Christianity emerged from Judaism, and, shaking off the restrictions and obligations of the Mosaic law, admitted the Gentiles to a full participation of its privileges historically true? Is the representation which is made of the conduct and teaching of the older Apostles on the one hand, and of Paul on the other, and of their mutual relations an accurate one? Can the Acts of the Apostles, in short, be considered a sober and veracious history of so important and interesting an epoch of the christian Church? This has been vehemently disputed or denied, and the discussion, extending on every side into important collateral issues, forms in itself a literature of voluminous extent and profound interest. Our path now lies through this debatable land; but although the controversy as to the connection of Paul with the development of Christianity and his relation to the Apostles of the Circumcision cannot be altogether avoided, it only partially concerns us. We are freed from the necessity of advancing any particular theory, and have here no further interest in it than to inquire whether the narrative of the Acts is historical or not. If, therefore, avoiding many important but unnecessary questions, and restricting ourselves to a straight course across the great controversy, we seem to deal insufficiently with the general subject, it must be remembered that the argument is merely incidental to our inquiry, and that we not only do not

pretend to exhaust it, but distinctly endeavour to reduce our share in it to the smallest limits compatible with our immediate object.

According to the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, the apostolic age presents a most edifying example of concord and moderation. The emancipation of the Church from Mosaic restrictions was effected without strife or heart-burning, and the freedom of the Gospel, if not attained without hesitation, was finally proclaimed with singular largeness of mind and philosophic liberality. The teaching of Paul differed in nothing from that of the elder apostles. The christian universalism, which so many suppose to have specially characterized the great Apostle of the Gentiles, was not only shared, but even anticipated, by the elder Apostles. So far from opposing the free admission of the Gentiles to the christian community, Peter declares himself to have been chosen of God that by his voice they should hear the gospel,[1] proclaims that there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile,[2] and advocates the abrogation, in their case at least, of the Mosaic law.[3] James, whatever his private predilections may be, exhibits almost equal forbearance and desire of conciliation. In fact, whatever anomalies and contradictions may be discoverable, upon close examination, beneath this smooth and brilliant surface, the picture superficially presented is one of singular harmony and peace. On the other hand, instead of that sensitive independence and self-reliance of character which has been ascribed to the Apostle Paul, we find him represented in the Acts as submissive to the authority of the "Pillars" of the church, ready to conform to their

[1] Acts xv. 7. [2] xv. 9. [3] Acts xv. 10.

counsels and bow to their decrees, and as seizing every opportunity of visiting Jerusalem, and coming in contact with that stronghold of Judaism. Instead of the Apostle of the Gentiles, preaching the abrogation of the law, and more than suspected of leading the Jews to apostatize from Moses,[1] we find a man even scrupulous in his observance of Mosaic customs, taking vows upon him, circumcising Timothy with his own hand, and declaring at the close of his career, when a prisoner at Rome, that he "did nothing against the people or the customs of the fathers."[2] There is no trace of angry controversy, of jealous susceptibility, of dogmatic difference in the circle of the apostles. The intercourse of Paul with the leaders of the Judaistic party is of the most unbroken pleasantness and amity. Of opposition to his ministry, or doubt of his apostleship, whether on the part of the Three, or of those who identified themselves with their teaching, we have no hint. We must endeavour to ascertain whether this is a true representation of the early development of the Church, and of the momentous history of the apostolic age.

In the epistles of Paul we have, at least to some extent, the means of testing the accuracy of the statements of the Acts with regard to him and the early history of the Church. The Epistles to the Galatians, to the Corinthians (2), and to the Romans are generally admitted to be genuine,[3] and can be freely used for this purpose. To these we shall limit our attention, excluding other epistles, whose authenticity is either questioned or denied, but in doing so no material capable of really affecting the result is set aside. For the same reason, we

[1] Acts xxi. 21.
[2] Acts xxviii. 17.
[3] In great part, at least.

must reject any evidence to be derived from the so-called Epistles of Peter and James, at least so far as they are supposed to represent the opinions of Peter and James, but here again it will be found that they do not materially affect the points immediately before us. The veracity of the Acts of the Apostles being the very point which is in question, it is unnecessary to say that we have to subject the narrative to examination, and by no means to assume the correctness of any statements we find in it. At the same time it must be our endeavour to collect from this document such indications—and they will frequently be valuable—of the true history of the occurrences related, as may be presented between the lines of the text.

In the absence of fuller information, it must not be forgotten that human nature in the first century of our era was very much what it is in the nineteenth, and certain facts being clearly established, it will not be difficult to infer many details which cannot now be positively demonstrated. The Epistle to the Galatians, however, will be our most invaluable guide. Dealing, as it does, with some of the principal episodes of the Acts, we are enabled by the words of the apostle Paul himself, which have all the accent of truth and vehement earnestness, to control the narrative of the unknown writer of that work. And where this source fails, we have the unsuspected testimony of his other epistles, and of later ecclesiastical history to assist our inquiry.

The problem then which we have to consider is the manner in which the primitive Church emerged from its earliest form, as a Jewish institution with Mosaic restrictions and Israelitish exclusiveness, and finally opened wide its doors to the uncircumcised Gentile, and assumed

the character of a universal religion. In order to understand the nature of the case, and be able to estimate aright the solution which is presented by the narrative in the Acts of the Apostles, it is necessary that we should obtain a clear view of the actual characteristics of Christianity at the period when that history begins. We must endeavour to understand precisely what view the Apostles had formed of their position in regard to Judaism, and of the duty which devolved upon them of propagating the Gospel. It is obvious that we cannot rightly appreciate the amount of persuasion requisite to transform the primitive Church from Jewish exclusiveness to Christian universality, without ascertaining the probable amount of long rooted conviction and religious prejudice or principle which had to be overcome before that great change could be effected.

We shall not here enter upon any argument as to the precise views which the Founder of Christianity may have held as to his own person and work, nor shall we attempt to sift the traditions of his life and teaching which have been handed down to us, and to separate the genuine spiritual nucleus from the grosser matter by which it has been enveloped and obscured. We have much more to do with the view which others took of the matter, and, looking at the Gospels as representations of that which was accepted as the orthodox view regarding the teaching of Jesus, they are almost as useful for our present purpose as if they had been more spiritual and less popular expositions of his views. What the Master was understood to teach is more important for the history of the first century than what he actually taught without being understood. Nothing is more certain than the fact that Christianity, originally, was

developed out of Judaism, and that its advent was historically prepared by the course of the Mosaic system, to which it was so closely related.[1] In its first stages during the apostolic age, it had no higher ambition than to be, and to be considered, the continuation and the fulfilment of Judaism, its final and triumphant phase. The substantial identity of primitive Christianity with true Judaism was at first never called in question; it was considered a mere internal movement of Judaism, its development and completion, but by no means its mutilation. The idea of Christianity as a new religion never entered the minds of the Twelve or of the first believers, nor, as we shall presently see, was it so regarded by the Jews themselves. It was in fact, originally, nothing more than a sect of Judaism, holding a particular view of one point in the creed, and, for a very long period, it was considered so by others, and was in no way distinguished from the rest of Mosaism.[2] Even in the Acts there are traces of this, Paul being called "a ringleader of the sect (αἵρεσις) of the Nazarenes," and the Jews of Rome being represented as referring to Christianity by this term.[4] Paul before the Council not

[1] *Rothe* Anfänge d. chr. Kirche, 1837, i. p, 326.

[2] *Bleek*, Hebräerbr. i. 1. p. 56 ff., 60 f.; *Credner*, Das N. T., 1847, ii. p. 20 ff.; *Gfrörer*, K. G., i. p. 222 f., 238; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 365 ff., 369; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 377 f., 380; *Nicolas*, Études N. T., p. 237 f.; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, xiiime éd., p. 47 f.; Les Apôtres, p. 91 ff.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 19 ff., 40 f.; Hist. Théol. Chr., i. p. 283 f.; *Réville*, Essais de critique religieuse, 1860, p. 18; *Rothe*, Anfänge chr. Kirche, i. p. 142 ff.; *Schliemann*, Die Clementinen, p. 371 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 21, 91 ff., 99 ff., 113 f.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 52 f., 56 f.; *Zeller*, Gesch. chr. Kirche, 1848, p. 5 f. Cf. *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 287 ff., 330 ff.; *Lightfoot*, The Epistles of St. Paul, Galatians, 4th ed., p. 302; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 33 ff., 46 f.

[3] Acts xxiv. 5.

[4] Acts xxviii. 22.

only does not scruple to call himself "a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee," but the Pharisees take part with him against the more unorthodox and hated sect of the Sadducees.[1] For eighteen centuries disputes have fiercely raged over the creed of Christendom, and the ingenuity of countless divines has been exhausted in deducing mystic dogmas from the primitive teaching, but if there be one thing more remarkable than another in that teaching, according to the Synoptics, it is its perfect simplicity. Jesus did not appear with a ready-made theology, and imposed no elaborate system of doctrine upon his disciples. Throughout the prophetic period of Mosaism, one hope had sustained the people of Israel in all their sufferings and reverses: that the fortunes of the nation should finally be retrieved by a scion of the race of David, under whose rule it should be restored to a future of unexampled splendour and prosperity. The expectation of the Messiah, under frequently modified aspects, had formed a living part in the religion of Israel. Primitive Christianity, reviving and recasting this ancient hope, was only distinguished from Judaism, with whose worship it continued in all points united, by a single doctrine, which did not in itself pass beyond the limits of the national religion: the belief that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ, the promised Messiah. This was substantially the whole of its creed.[2]

[1] Acts xxiii. 6 ff.

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 49 f.; *Bleek*, Hebräerbr., i. 1. p. 56 f.; *Credner*, Das N. T., i. p. 2, 14 f., ii. p. 20 ff.; *von Döllinger*, Christ. u. Kirche, p. 59; *Gfrörer*, K. G., i. p. 222; *Hase*, Das Leben Jesu, p. 153 f.; *Hemsen*, Der Apost. Paulus, 1830, p. 26, 35 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1860, p. 108; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. des Paul. u. des Petrus, 1868, p. 40 ff., 98, 236 f.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 364 ff.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 16 f., 245; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 140 ff., 377 f., et passim; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 21 ff.; K. G.,

The synoptic Gospels, and more especially the first,[1] are clearly a history of Jesus as the Messiah of the house of David, so long announced and expected, and whose life and even his death and resurrection are shown to be the fulfilment of a series of Old Testament prophecies.[2] When his birth is announced to Mary, he is described as the great one, who is to sit on the throne of David his father, and reign over the house of Jacob for ever,[3] and the good tidings of great joy to all the people (παντὶ τῷ λαῷ), that the Messiah is born that day in the city of David, are proclaimed by the angel to the shepherds of the plain.[4] Symeon takes the child in his arms and blesses God that the words of the Holy Spirit are accomplished, that he should not die before he had seen the Lord's anointed, the Messiah, the consolation of Israel.[5] The Magi come to his cradle in Bethlehem, the birthplace of the Messiah indicated by the prophet,[6] to do homage to him who is born King of the Jews,[7] and there Herod seeks to destroy him,[8] fulfilling another

1843, i. 2. p. 590; *Nicolas*, Ét. N. T., p. 237; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 91; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 19 f.; Hist. Théol. Chr., i. p. 283 f.; *Réville*, Essais, p. 42; *Rothe*, Anfänge chr. Kirche, 1837, i. p. 142 ff.; *Schliemann*, Die Clementinen, p. 371 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 21, 91 ff., 113 f., 139 f.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 516 f.; *Zeller*, Gesch. chr. K., p. 5; Vorträge, p. 202 f., 216 f. Cf. *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 265 ff., 278 ff., vi. 135 f., 401, 422 f.

[1] The Gospel commences with the announcement, i. 1, 17, 18. Cf. Mk. i. 1 ff.

[2] *Baur*, N. T. Theologie, 1864, p. 298 ff.; Theol. Jahrb., 1853, p. 77 f.; *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 60; Das N. T., ii. p. 150 ff.; *Delitzsch*, Ursprung d. Matth Ev., 1853, p. 58 ff.; *D'Eichthal*, Les Evangiles, i. p. 51; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., iii. p. 319 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., i. p. 52 f.; *Köstlin*, Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 6 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 91, 101 ff. Cf. *Holtzmann*, Die synopt. Evv., p. 381 ff.

[3] Luke i. 32, 33.

[4] Luke ii. 10 ff.

[5] Luke ii. 25—28. So also Elizabeth, ii. 38.

[6] Matth. ii. 5, 6. Cf. Micah v. 2.

[7] Mt. ii. 2.

[8] Mt. ii. 16 f.

prophecy.[1] His flight into Egypt and return to Nazareth are equally in fulfilment of prophecies.[2] John the Baptist, whose own birth as the forerunner of the Messiah had been foretold,[3] goes before him preparing the way of the Lord, and announcing that the Messianic kingdom is at hand. According to the fourth Gospel, some of the twelve had been disciples of the Baptist, and follow Jesus on their master's assurance that he is the Messiah. One of these, Andrew, induces his brother *Simon Peter also to go after him* by the announcement:—"*We have found the Messiah*, which is, being *interpreted, the Christ*" (i. 35ff. 41). And Philip tells Nathaniel:—"We have found him of whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets did write: Jesus, the son of Joseph, who is from Nazareth" (i. 45). When he has commenced his own public ministry, Jesus is represented as asking his disciples:—"Who do men say that I am?" and setting aside the popular conjectures that he is John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets, by the still more direct question:—"And whom do ye say that I am? Simon Peter answered and said:—Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." And in consequence of this recognition of his Messiahship, Jesus rejoins:—"And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church."[4]

[1] Mt. ii. 17 f. [2] Mt. ii. 23.

[3] Luke i. 17 (cf. Mt. xi. 14, xvii. 12 f.; Mk. ix. 11 ff.), ii. 67 ff.; Mt. iii. 3; Mk. i. 1 ff.

[4] Mt. xvi. 13—18; cf. Mk. viii. 29; Luke ix. 20. Neander says: "And because this conviction, rooted in the depth of the soul, that Jesus is the Messiah, is the foundation upon which the kingdom of God rests, Christ therefore names him in reference to this the Rock-man (Felsenmann) and the Rock upon which he should build the everlasting Church." Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 449.

It is quite apart from our present object to show by what singular feats of exegesis and perversions of historical sense passages of the Old Testament are forced to show that every event in the history, and even the startling novelty of a suffering and crucified Messiah, which to Jews was a stumbling-block and to Gentiles folly,[1] had been foretold by the prophets. From first to last the Gospels strive to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, and connect him indissolubly with the Old Testament. The Messianic key-note, which is struck at the outset, regulates the strain to the close. The disciples on the way to Emmaus, appalled by the ignominious death of their Master, sadly confide to the stranger their vanished hope that Jesus of Nazareth, whom they now merely call "a prophet mighty in word and deed before God and all the people," was he "who was about to redeem Israel," and Jesus himself replies:— "O foolish and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets spake! Was it not needful that the Christ (Messiah) should suffer these things and enter into his glory? And, beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."[2] Then, again, when he appears to the eleven, immediately after, at Jerusalem, he says:— "'These are the words that I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and the prophets and the Psalms concerning me.' Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them:—'Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and rise from the dead the third day.'"[3]

[1] 1 Cor. i. 23. [2] Luke xxiv. 15—17.
[3] Luke xxiv. 44—46.

The crucifixion and death of Jesus introduced the first elements of rupture with Judaism, to which they formed the great stumbling-block.[1] The conception of a suffering and despised Messiah could naturally never have occurred to a Jewish mind.[2] The first effort of Christianity, therefore, was to repair the apparent breach by proving that the suffering Messiah had actually been foretold by the prophets; and to re-establish the Messianic character of Jesus, by the evidence of his resurrection.[3] But, above all, the momentary deviation from orthodox Jewish ideas regarding the Messiah was retraced by the representation of a speedy second advent, in glory, of the once rejected Messiah to restore the kingdom of Israel, in which the ancient hopes of the people became reconciled with the new expectation of Christians. Even before the Ascension, the disciples are represented in the Acts as asking the risen Jesus:—"Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"[4] There can be no doubt of the reality and

[1] *Baur*, K. G. i. p. 39 ff.; N. T. Theol., p. 129 ff., 305 ff.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 340; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., ii. 2te Aufl., p. 333 f.; Der Ap. Paulus, 2te Aufl., p. 132; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paul., u. s. w., p. 40 ff., 98 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 366 f.; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 338 ff., 352 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 91 f.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 518 f.; *Weizsäcker*, Unters. ev. Gesch., p. 476 f.

[2] In the Gospels, the disciples are represented as not understanding such a representation, and Peter, immediately after the famous declaration, "Thou art the Christ," rebukes Jesus for such an idea. Mt. xvi. 21 ff.; cf. Mk. ix. 32; Luke ix. 45, xviii. 34, &c., &c.

[3] *Baur*, N. T. Theol., p, 305 ff.; *Credner*, Das N. T., i. p, 141 f.; *Hausrath*, N. T., Zeitg., ii. p. 334 ff., 341; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w., p. 98 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 367 f.; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 355 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 91; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 305 f.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 518 f.

[4] Acts i, 6. Hase pertinently observes: "The Apostolic Church, both before and after the destruction of Jerusalem, devoutly expected from day to day the return of Christ. If an interval of thousands of years

universality of the belief, in the Apostolic Church, in the immediate return of the glorified Messiah and speedy "end of all things."[1]

The substance of the preaching of the Apostles in Acts, simply is that Jesus is the Christ,[2] the expected Messiah.[3] Their chief aim is to prove that his sufferings and death had been foretold by the prophets,[4] and that his resurrection establishes his claim to the title.[5] The simplicity of the creed is illustrated by the rapidity with which converts are made. After a few words, on one occasion, three thousand[6] and, on another, five thousand[7] are at once converted. No lengthened instruction or preparation was requisite for admission into the Church.[8] As soon as a Jew acknowledged Jesus to be the Messiah he thereby became a Christian.[9] As soon as the

(Jahrtausenden) occur between both events, then there is either an error in the prophecy or in the tradition." Das Leben Jesu, 5te Aufl., p. 226.

[1] *Credner*, Einl., i. p. 198; Das N. T. ii. p. 20 f.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vii. p. 34 ff.; *Hase*, Das Leben Jesu, p. 226 f.; *Jowett*, The Epistles of St. Paul, 1855, i. p. 96 ff.; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 378, 418 f.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 92; St. Paul, p. 248 f.; L'Antechrist, p. 338 f.; *Reuss*, Hist. Théol. Chr., i. p. 423 ff.; *Réville*, Essais, p. 21; *Zeller*, Vorträge, p. 221 ff.

[2] Cf. Acts ix. 22, ii. 36, v. 42, viii. 4 f., 35, x. 36 ff., xiii. 23 ff., xvii. 3, xviii. 5, 28, xxvi. 22 f. Hegesippus says of James that he was a witness both to Jews and Greeks that Jesus is the Christ. Euseb., H. E., ii. 25.

[3] *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 16 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 24 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 103; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 20; Hist. Théol. Chr., i. p. 283 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 91.

[4] Acts ii. 23 ff., iii. 13 ff., xxvi. 22 f.

[5] Acts ii. 31, iii. 26, iv. 33, v. 30 f., x. 40 ff. See references in note 3, p. 120.

[6] Acts ii. 41.

[7] Acts iv. 4. There may be doubt as to the number on this occasion.

[8] *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 365 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 25; *de Pressensé*, Hist. trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 377; *Zeller*, Vorträge, p. 202 f.

[9] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 49, ii. p. 134 f.; *Bleek*, Hebräerbr., i. 1. p. 56 f.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 365 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 25; *Reuss*, Hist. Théol. Chr., p. 283 f.; *Schliemann*, Die Clementinen,

three thousand converts at Pentecost made this confession of faith they were baptized.[1] The Ethiopian is converted whilst passing in his chariot, and is immediately baptized,[2] as are likewise Cornelius and his household after a short address from Peter.[3] The new faith involved no abandonment of the old. On the contrary, the advent of the Messiah was so essential a part of Judaic belief, and the Messianic claim of Jesus was so completely based by the Apostles on the fulfilment of prophecy—"showing by the Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ,"—that recognition of the fact rather constituted firmer adhesion to Mosaism, and deeper faith in the inviolable truth of the Covenant with Israel. If there had been no Mosaism, so to say, there could have been no Messiah. So far from being opposed either to the form or spirit of the religion of Israel, the proclamation of the Messiah was its necessary complement, and could only be intelligible by confirmation of its truth and maintenance of its validity. Christianity—belief in the Messiah—in its earlier phases, drew its whole nourishment from roots that sank deeply into Mosaism. It was indeed nothing more than Mosaism in a developed form. The only difference between the Jew and the Christian was that the latter believed the Messiah to have already appeared in Jesus, whilst the former still expected him in the future;[4] though even this difference

p. 371 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 21; *Zeller*, Vorträge, p. 202 f., 216 f.

[1] Acts ii. 41. [2] Acts viii. 35 f.

[3] Acts x. 47 f.

[4] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 49; K. G. i. p. 36 ff.; *Credner*, Das N. T., i. p. 2 f., p. 14 f., ii. p. 20 ff.; *Gfrörer*, K. G. i. p. 222; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 24 ff., 33 ff.; *Nicolas*, Études, N. T., p. 237; *Schliemann*, Die Clementinen, p. 371 ff.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 516 f.; *Zeller*, Gesch. chr. K., p. 5 f.; Vorträge, p. 202 f., 216 f.

was singularly diminished, in appearance at least, by the Christian expectation of the second advent.

It is exceedingly important to ascertain, under these circumstances, what was the impression of the Apostles as to the relation of believers to Judaism and to Mosaic observances, although it must be clear to any one who impartially considers the origin and historical antecedents of the Christian faith, that very little doubt can have existed in their minds on the subject. The teaching of Jesus, as recorded in the synoptic Gospels, is by no means of a doubtful character, more especially when the sanctity of the Mosaic system in the eyes of a Jew is borne in mind. It must be apparent that, in order to remove the obligation of a Law and form of worship believed to have been, in the most direct sense, instituted by God himself, the most clear, strong, and reiterated order would have been requisite. No one can reasonably maintain that a few spiritual expressions directed against the bare letter and abuse of the law, which were scarcely understood by the hearers, could have been intended to abolish a system so firmly planted, or to overthrow Jewish institutions of such antiquity and national importance, much less that they could be taken in this sense by the disciples. A few passages in the Gospels, therefore, which may bear the interpretation of having foreseen the eventual supercession of Mosaism by his own more spiritual principles, must not be strained to support the idea that Jesus taught disregard of the Law. The very distinct and positive lessons, conveyed both by precept and practice, show, on the contrary, that not only he did not intend to attack Mosaism, but that he was understood both directly and by inference to recognise and confirm it. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus

states to the disciples in the most positive manner:—"Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall not pass from the law, till all be accomplished."[1] Whether the last phrase be interpreted: till all the law be accomplished, or till all things appointed to occur be accomplished, the effect is the same. One clear explicit declaration like this, under the circumstances, would outweigh a host of doubtful expressions. Not only does Jesus in this passage directly repudiate any idea of attacking the law and the prophets, but, in representing his mission as their fulfilment, he affirms them, and associates his own work in the closest way with theirs. If there were any uncertainty, however, as to the meaning of his words it would be removed by the continuation:—"Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these commandments, even the least, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."[2] It would be difficult for teaching to be more decisive in favour of the maintenance of the law, and this instruction, according to the first Synoptic, was specially directed to the disciples.[3] When Jesus goes on to show that their righteousness must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, and to add to the letter of the law, as interpreted by those of old, his own profound interpretation of its

[1] Mt. v. 17, 18; cf. xxiii. 2 ff.; cf. Luke xvi. 17.

[2] Mt. v. 19. *Hilgenfeld* (Einl. N. T. p. 469 f.) and some others consider this, as well as other parts of the Sermon on the Mount, to be inserted as a direct attack upon Pauline teaching.

[3] Mt. v. 1, 2. *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 35; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. N. T., p. 469.

spirit, he only intensifies, without limiting, the operation of the law; he merely spiritualises it. He does no more than this in his lessons regarding the observance of the Sabbath. He did not in point of fact attack the genuine Mosaic institution of the day of rest at all, but merely the intolerable literalism by which its observance had been made a burden instead of "a delight." He justified his variation from the traditional teaching and practice of his time, however, by appeals to Scriptural precedent.[1] As a recent writer has said: ".... the observance of the Sabbath, which had been intended to secure for weary men a rest full of love and peace and mercy, had become a mere national Fetish—a barren custom fenced in with the most frivolous and senseless restrictions."[2] Jesus restored its original significance. In restricting some of the permissive clauses of the Law, on the other hand, he acted precisely in the same spirit. He dealt with the Law not with the temper of a revolutionist, but of a reformer, and his reforms, so far from affecting its permanence, are a virtual confirmation of the rest of the code.[3] Ritschl, whose views on this point will have some weight with apologists, combats the idea that Jesus merely confirmed the Mosaic moral law, and abolished the ceremonial law. Referring to one particular point of importance, he says:—"He certainly contests the duty of the Sabbath rest, the value of purifications and sacrifices, and the validity of divorce; on the other hand, he leaves unattacked the value of circumcision, whose regulation is generally reckoned as part of the

[1] Mt. xii. 3 ff.; Mk. ii. 25 ff.; Luke vi. 3 ff.

[2] *Farrar*, Life of Christ, i. p. 375, cf. p. 431 f., ii. 115 ff.

[3] *Ritschl* limits the application of much of the modification of the law ascribed to Jesus to the disciples, as members of the "kingdom of God." Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 29 ff.

ceremonial law; and nothing justifies the conclusion that Jesus estimated it in the same way as Justin Martyr, and the other Gentile Christian Church teachers, who place it on the same line as the ceremonies. The only passage in which Jesus touches upon circumcision (John vii. 22) rather proves that, as an institution of the patriarchs, he attributes to it peculiar sanctity. Moreover, when Jesus, with unmistakable intention, confines his own personal ministry to the Israelitish people (Mk. vii. 27, Mt. x. 5, 6), he thereby recognises their prior right of participation in the Kingdom of God, and also, indirectly, circumcision as the sign of the preference of this people. The distinction of circumcision from ceremonies, besides, is perfectly intelligible from the Old Testament. Through circumcision, to wit, is the Israelite, sprung from the people of the Covenant, indicated as sanctified by God; through purification, sacrifice, Sabbath-rest must he continually sanctify himself for God. So long, therefore, as the conception of the people of the Covenant is maintained, circumcision cannot be abandoned, whilst even the prophets have pointed to the merely relative importance of the Mosaic worship." [1]

Jesus everywhere in the Gospels recognises the divine origin of the law,[2] and he quotes the predictions of the prophets as absolute evidence of his own pretentions. To those who ask him the way to eternal life he indicates its commandments,[3] and he even enjoins the observance of its ceremonial rites.[4] Jesus did not abrogate the

[1] *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 34, cf. 46 f.

[2] Mt. xv. 4, &c., &c. Paley says: "Undoubtedly our Saviour assumes the divine origin of the Mosaic institution." A View of the Evidences, &c., &c., ed. Potts, 1850, p. 262.

[3] Mt. xix. 17; Mk. x. 17; Luke xviii. 18; x. 25 f., xv. 29, 31, 32.

[4] Mt. viii. 4; Luke v. 14; John vii. 8.

Mosaic law; but, on the contrary, by his example as well as his precepts, he practically confirmed it.[1]

It is evident from the statement of the Gospels that Jesus himself observed the prescriptions of the Mosaic law.[2] From his birth he had been brought up in its worship.[3] He was circumcised on the eighth day.[4] "And when the days of their purification were accomplished, according to the law of Moses, they brought him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord, even as it is written in the law of the Lord: Every male, &c., &c., and to give a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord," &c., &c.[5] Every year his parents went to Jerusalem at the feast of the Passover,[6] and this practice he continued till the close of his life. "As his custom was, he went into the Synagogue (at Nazareth) and stood up to read."[7] According to the fourth Gospel, Jesus goes up to Jerusalem for the various festivals of the Jews,[8] and the feast of the Passover, according to the Synoptics, was the last memorable supper eaten

[1] *D'Eichthal*, Les Evangiles, i. p. 43 ff.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 430 f.; *Hase*, Das Leb. Jesu, 5te Aufl., p. 149 ff.; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., ii. 2te Aufl., p. 406 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl. p. 469 f.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 365 f.; *Keim*, Der gesch. Christus, 1866, p. 47 ff.; Jesu v. Nazara, ii., 1871, p. 242 ff., 263 ff.; *Köstlin*, Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 11 ff.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 285 f.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 200; *Neander*, K. G. 1843, ii. p. 590 f.; *Reuss*, Hist. Théol. Chr., i. p. 165 f., 263; *Ritschl*, Entst. d. altk. Kirche, 2te Aufl., p. 28 ff., p. 45 ff., 140; *Stap*, Origines, p. 46 ff. Cf. *Baur*, N. T. Theol., p. 46 ff.; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 209 ff., 217 ff.

[2] *Bleek*, Hebräerbr., i. p. 56; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 430 f.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 288 f.; *Lightfoot*, Eps. of St. Paul, Colossians, &c., 1875, p. 174 f.; *Neander*, K. G. ii. p. 590 f.; Pflanzung, p. 47; *Reuss*, Théol. Chr., i. p. 167 f., 263; *Réville*, Essais, p. 15; *Stap*, Origines, p. 47 f., 53.

[3] Cf. Gal. iv. 4.

[4] Luke ii. 21.

[5] Luke ii. 22 ff.

[6] Luke ii. 41.

[7] Luke iv. 16.

[8] John v. 1, vii. 8, 10, x. 22 f., xi. 55, 56, xii. 1, 12; xiii. 1 f.

with his disciples,[1] the third Synoptic representing him as saying: "With desire I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you that I will not any more eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."[2] However exceptional the character of Jesus, and however elevated his views, it is undeniable that he lived and died a Jew, conforming to the ordinances of the Mosaic law in all essential points, and not holding himself aloof from the worship of the Temple which he purified. The influence which his adherence to the forms of Judaism must have exerted over his followers[3] can scarcely be exaggerated, and the fact must ever be carefully borne in mind in estimating the conduct of the Apostles and of the primitive Christian community after his death.

As befitted the character of the Jewish Messiah, the sphere of the ministry of Jesus and the arrangements for the proclamation of the Gospel were strictly and even intensely Judaic. Jesus attached to his person twelve disciples, a number clearly typical of the twelve tribes of the people of Israel;[4] and this reference is distinctly adopted when Jesus is represented, in the Synoptics, as promising that, in the Messianic kingdom, "when the Son

[1] Mt. xxvi. 17 ff.; Mk. xiv. 12 ff.; Luke xxii. 7 ff.

[2] Luke xxii. 15 f.

[3] *Ewald*, Gesch V. Isr., vi. p. 430 f.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap Z. p. 288 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 47; K. G., ii. p. 590.

[4] *Delitzsch*, Urspr. Matth.-Ev., p. 89 f.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 388; *Gfrörer*, Das Jahrb. des Heils, ii. p. 369 f.; *Gieseler*, Entst. schr. Evv., p. 127 f.; *Hase*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 139 ff.; *Hausrath*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 186; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, ii. p. 303 f.; *Mosheim*, Inst. Hist. Eccles. sæc., i. pars. i. c. iii. § 6; *Neander*, Das Leben Jesu, 7te Aufl., p. 144 ff.; *de Pressensé*, Hist. trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 376; *Reuss*, Théol. Chr., ii. p. 347; *Ritschl*, Das Ev. Marcions, p. 185; *Scherer*, Rev. de Théol., iv. 1859, p. 340 f.; *Scholten*, Het paulin. Ev., p. 100; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 46; *Stap*, Origines, p. 47 f.; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 270; *Weisse*, Die evang. Geschichte, ii. p. 394; *De Wette*, Einl. N. T., p. 179.

of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory," the Twelve also "shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel;"[1] a promise which, according to the third Synoptist, is actually made during the last supper.[2] In the Apocalypse, which, "of all the writings of the New Testament is most thoroughly Jewish in its language and imagery,"[3] the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb are written upon the twelve foundations of the wall of the heavenly Jerusalem, upon the twelve gates of which, through which alone access to the city can be obtained, are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel.[4] Jesus himself limited his teaching to the Jews, and was strictly "a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."[5] To the prayer of the Canaanitish woman: "Have mercy on me, O Lord, Son of David," unlike his gracious demeanour to her of the bloody issue,[6] Jesus, at first, it is said, "answered her not a word;" and even when besought by the disciples—not to heal her daughter, but—to "send her away," he makes the emphatic declaration: "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel."[7] To her continued appeals he lays

[1] Mt. xix. 28. [2] Luke xxii. 30.

[3] *Lightfoot*, St. Paul's Ep. to the Galatians, 4th ed., p. 343.

[4] Rev. xxi. 12, 14.

[5] Rom. xv. 8. *Alford*, Greek Test., i. p. 164 f.; *D'Eichthal*, Les Evangiles, i. p. 47 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw. iv., 1864, p. 57; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., ii. p. 407 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 86 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., ii. p. 405 ff.; *Klostermann*, Das Marcusevang, 1867, p. 156 f.; *Meyer*, Ev. Matth., 5te Aufl., p. 251, p. 340 f.; *Mosheim*, Inst. Hist. Eccles., i. pars. i. c. iii. §§ 6, 7; *Neander*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 369; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, xiii. ed., p. 458 f.; *Reuss*, Théol. Chr., ii. p. 346 f.; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 34, 141; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 217 ff.; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., 1838, ii. p. 61. Cf. *Ewald*, Die drei erst. Evv., p. 247 f., 266.

[6] Matth. ix. 22.

[7] This expression does not occur in the parallel in Mark.

down the principle: "It is not lawful to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs." If after these exclusive sentences the boon is finally granted, it is as of the crumbs [1] which fall from the master's table.[2] The modified expression[3] in the second Gospel: "Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs;" does not affect the case, for it equally represents exclusion from the privileges of Israel, and the Messianic idea fully contemplated a certain grace to the heathen when the children were filled. The expression regarding casting the children's bread "to the dogs" is clearly in reference to the Gentiles, who were so called by the Jews.[4] A similar, though still stronger use of such expressions, might be pointed out in the Sermon on the Mount in the first

[1] These ψίχια, it is supposed, may mean the morsels of bread on which the hands were wiped after they had, in Eastern fashion, been thrust into the dishes before them.

[2] Mt. xv. 22 ff.; cf. Mk. vii. 25 ff. Some commentators, as Kuinoel, Lange, Ebrard, Wordsworth, Farrar, Baur, and others, read the words of Jesus, throughout, either as a trial of the woman's faith, or not seriously to be understood in their obvious sense.

[3] *Meyer* (Ev. Mark. u. Luk., p. 99 f.) considers the ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα of the second Synoptic a modification of later tradition. He holds that the episode in Mt. has the impress of greater originality. So also *Weiss*, Das Marcusev. erklärt, 1872, p. 254 ff.; *Scholten*, Das ält. Evang., p. 157 f.; *Ewald*, Drei erst. Evv., p. 266; *De Wette*, K. Erkl. Evv. des Luk. u. Mark., 1846, p. 203; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., ii. p. 407, anm.

[4] *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Comm. Ev. Matth., 1844, p. 272; *Eisenmenger*, Entdecktes Judenthum, i. p. 713 ff., ii. p. 630, 635 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 86 f.; Einl., p. 479; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iv. p. 57; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, ii. p. 407, anm. 4; *Klostermann*, Das Marcusev. p. 157; *Lightfoot*, Horæ Hebr., Works, xi. p. 220; *Meyer*, Ev. Matth., p. 340 f.; *De Wette*, K. Erkl. Ev. Matth., 4te Aufl., p. 901; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test., The Four Gospels, p. 55. Dr. Wordsworth says: "κυναρίοις] *curs.* Not that our Lord regarded them as such, but because they were so called by the Jews, whose language he adopts. κυνάριον is a contemptuous diminutive." Greek Test., The Four Gospels, On Mt. xv. 26, p. 55. Many critics argue that the diminutive κυνάρια for κύνες removes the offensive term from the heathen.

Gospel (vii. 6): "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine." It is certain that the Jews were in the habit of speaking of the heathen both as dogs and swine—unclean animals,—and Hilgenfeld,[1] and some other critics, see in this verse a reference to the Gentiles. We do not, however, press this application which is, and may be, disputed, but merely mention it and pass on. There can be no doubt, however, of the exclusive references to the Gentiles in the same sermon, and other passages, where the disciples are enjoined to practice a higher righteousness than the Gentiles. "Do not even the publicans. . . do not even the Gentiles or sinners the same things."[2] "Take no thought, &c., for after all these things do the Gentiles seek; but seek ye, &c., &c."[3] The contrast is precisely that put with some irony by Paul, making use of the common Jewish expression "sinner" as almost equivalent for "Gentile;"[4] In another place the first Synoptic represents Jesus as teaching his disciples how to deal with a brother who sins against them, and as the final resource, when every effort at reconciliation and justice has failed, he says: "Let him be unto thee as the Gentile (ἐθνικὸς) and the publican." (Mt. xviii. 17.) He could not express in a stronger way to a Jewish mind the idea of social and religious excommunication.

The instructions which Jesus gives in sending out the Twelve, however, express the exclusiveness of the

[1] *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 64; Einl., p. 470; *Reuss*, Théol. Chr., ii. p. 348. Cf. *Schoettgen*, Horæ Hebr., p. 87; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, ii. p. 406, anm. 3; *Köstlin*, Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 178.

[2] Mt. v. 46 f., vi. 7 f.; cf. Luke vi. 32 ff., where "sinners" is substituted for "Gentiles."

[3] Mt. vi. 31 f.; cf. xx. 25 f.; Luke xii. 30.

[4] Gal. ii. 15; cf. *Lightfoot*, St. Paul's Ep. to Gal., 4th ed., p. 114.

Messianic mission, in the first instance at least, to the Jews, in a very marked manner. Jesus commands his disciples: "Go not into a way of the Gentiles (ἐθνῶν) and into a city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go preach, saying: The kingdom of heaven is at hand."[1] As if more emphatically to mark the limitation of the mission the assurance is seriously added: "For verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man come."[2] It will be observed that Jesus here charges the Twelve to go rather "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" in the same words that he employs to the Canaanitish woman to describe the exclusive destination of his own ministry.[3] In coupling the Samaritans with the Gentiles there is merely an expression of the intense antipathy of the Jews against them, as a mixed and, we may say, renegade race, excluded from the Jewish worship although circumcised, intercourse with whom is to this day almost regarded as pollution.[4] The third Gospel, which omits the restrictive instructions of Jesus to the Twelve given by the first Synoptist, introduces another episode of the same description: the appointment and mission of Seventy disciples,[5] to which we must very briefly refer. No mention whatever is made of this incident in the other Gospels, and these disciples are not referred to in any other part of the New Testament.[6] Even Eusebius remarks that no

[1] Mt. x. 5—7; cf. Mk. iii. 13 f., vi. 7 ff.; Luke ix. 1 ff.

[2] Mt. x. 23.

[3] Mt. xv.; cf. Acts iii. 25, 26, xiii. 46.

[4] *Farrar*, Life of Christ, i. 208 f.

[5] Luke x. 1 ff. We need not discuss the precise number, whether 70 or 72. The very same uncertainty exists regarding the number of the elders and of the nations.

[6] Even *Thiersch* is struck by this singular fact. "It is remarkable,"

catalogue of them is anywhere given,[1] and, after naming a few persons, who were said by tradition to have been of their number, he points out that more than seventy disciples appear, for instance, according to the testimony of Paul.[2] It will be observed that the instructions, at least in considerable part, supposed to be given to the Seventy in the third Synoptic are, in the first, the very instructions given to the Twelve. There has been much discussion regarding the whole episode, which need not here be minutely referred to. For various reasons the majority of critics impugn its historical character.[3] A large number of these, as well as other writers, consider that the narrative of this appointment of seventy disciples, the number of the nations of the earth according to Jewish ideas, was introduced in Pauline universalistic interest,[4] or, at least, that the number is

he says, "that no further mention of the seventy disciples of Christ (Luke x. 1) occurs in the N. T., and that no credible tradition regarding them is preserved." Die Kirche im ap. Zeit., p. 79, anm. 2.

[1] *τῶν δ' ἑβδομήκοντα μαθητῶν, κατάλογος μὲν οὐδεὶς οὐδαμῆ φέρεται· Euseb.* H. E. i. 12.

[2] *καὶ τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα δὲ πλείους τοῦ σωτῆρος πεφηνέναι μαθητὰς εὕροις ἂν ἐπιτηρήσας, μάρτυρι χρώμενος τῷ Παύλῳ, κ. τ. λ.* Ib.: cf. 1 Cor. xv. 5 ff.

[3] *Baur*, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 434 f., 498 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 44 f.; *Ewald*, Die drei erst. Evv., p. 284 f.; Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 392 f.; *Gfrörer*, Das Jahrh. des Heils, ii. p. 371 f.; Die heil. Sage, i. p. 231 ff.; *Hase*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 200 f.; *Holtzmann*, Die synopt. Evv., 1863, p. 392 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, ii. p. 332 ff., 329 f., iii. p. 8 ff.; *Köstlin*, Urspr. synopt. Evv., p. 267 ff.; *Krüger-Velthusen*, Das Leben Jesu 1872, p. 173, anm. *; *Ritschl*, Das Ev. Marcions, p. 185 ff.; *Scherer*, Rev. de Théol., iv., 1859, p. 340 f.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., 1845, p. 274; *Scholten*, Het paul. Ev., p. 99 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 45 ff.; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 274 ff.; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., i. p. 405 f.; *Weizsäcker*, Unters. ev. Gesch., p. 409 f.; *De Wette*, Ev. Lucas u. Marc., 3te Aufl., p. 78 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 41, 448. Cf. *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 183 ff.; Die Evv. Justins, p. 356 f.

[4] *Baur*, Unters. kan. Evv., p. 435 f., 498 f.; K. G. i. p. 76, anm. 1; N. T. Theol., p. 329 f.; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 283 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 44 f.; *Gieseler*, Entst. schr. Evv., p. 127 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz.,

typical of Gentile conversion, in contrast with that of the Twelve who represent the more strictly Judaic limitation of the Messianic mission; and they seem to hold that the preaching of the seventy is represented as not confined to Judæa, but as extending to Samaria, and that it thus denoted the destination of the Gospel also to the Gentiles. On the other hand, other critics, many, though by no means all, of whom do not question the authenticity of the passage, are disposed to deny the Pauline tendency, and any special connection with a mission to the Gentiles, and rather to see in the number seventy a reference to well-known Judaistic institutions.[1] It is true that the number of the nations was set down at seventy by Jewish tradition,[2] but, on the other hand, it was the number of the elders chosen by Moses from amongst the children of Israel by God's command to help him, and to whom God gave of his spirit;[3] and also of the national

ii. p. 329; iii. p. 10 ff.; *Köstlin*, Urspr. syn. Evv., p. 267; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 157; *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm. i. 2. 4te Aufl., p. 591; *Reuss*, Théol. Chr., ii. p. 347 f.; *Ritschl*, Das Ev. Marcions, p. 185 f.; *Scherer*, Rev. de Théol., iv., 1859, p. 340 f.; *Scholten*, Het paul. Ev., p. 100 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 45 f.; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 274 ff.; *Volkmar*, Die Rel. Jesu, p. 308, 325; *De Wette*, Ev. Luc. u. Marc., p. 79; Einl. N. T., p. 179; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 41, 448. Cf. *Oosterzee*, Das Ev. n. Lukas, 3te Aufl., p. 162 f.

[1] *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Ev. des Mark. u. Lukas, 1845, p. 72; *Bengel*, Gnom. N. T., p. 295; *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 418 f.; *Ewald*, Die drei erst. Evv., p. 284 f.; cf. Die Alterth. d. V. Isr. 3te Aufl., p. 328 ff.; *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 99; *Gfrörer*, Das Jahrh. d. Heils, ii. p. 371 f.; Die heil. Sage, i. p. 235; *Holtzmann*, Die synopt. Evv., p. 392 f.; *Kuinoel*, Comm. N. T., ii. p. 450 f.; *Meyer*, Ev. des Mark. u. Lukas, p. 393 ff.; *Weiss*, Stud. u. Krit., 1861, p. 710 f. Cf. *Alford*, Greek Test., i. p. 536 f.; *Hase*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 200 f.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 274; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test., Four Gospels, p. 207.

[2] See S. R., 6th ed., i. p. 109 f.; Clem. Recog., ii. 42; *Epiphanius*, Haer., i. 5; *Eisenmenger*, Entd. Judenthum, ii. p. 3 ff., p. 736 f.

[3] Numbers xi. 16 ff., 25 ff. Also the number of the sons of Jacob who went into Egypt, Gen. xlvi. 27.

Sanhedrin, which, according to the Mischna,[1] still represented the Mosaic council. This view receives confirmation from the Clementine Recognitions in the following passage: "He therefore chose us twelve who first believed in him, whom he named Apostles; afterwards seventy-two other disciples of most approved goodness, that even in this way recognising the similitude of Moses the multitude might believe that this is the prophet to come whom Moses foretold."[2] The passage here referred to is twice quoted in the Acts: "Moses indeed said: A prophet will the Lord our God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me," &c.[3] On examination, we do not find that there is any ground for the assertion that the seventy disciples were sent to the Samaritans or Gentiles, or were in any way connected with universalistic ideas. Jesus had "stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem," and sent messengers before him who "went and entered into a village of the Samaritans to make ready for him," but they repulsed him, "because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem."[4] There is a decided break, however, before the appointment of the seventy. "After these things (μετὰ ταῦτα) the Lord appointed seventy others also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place whither he himself was about to come."[5] There is not a single word in the instructions

[1] Sanhedr. i. 6.

[2] Nos ergo primos elegit duodecim sibi credentes, quos Apostolos nominavit, postmodum alios septuaginta duos probatissimos discipulos, ut vel hoc modo recognita imagine Moysis crederet multitudo, quia hic est, quem praedixit Moysis venturum prophetam. Recog. i. 40. Cf. *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evv. Justins, p. 356 f. *Hilgenfeld* suggests the possibility of an earlier tradition out of which both the third Synoptist and the Clementines may have drawn their materials.

[3] Acts iii. 22, vii. 37; cf. Deuteron. xviii. 18.

[4] Luke ix. 51 ff. [5] Luke x. 1.

given to them which justifies the conclusion that they were sent to Samaria, and only the inference from the number seventy, taken as typical of the nations, suggests it. That inference is not sufficiently attested, and the slightness of the use made of the seventy disciples in the third Gospel—this occasion being the only one on which they are mentioned, and no specific intimation of any mission to all people being here given—does not favour the theory of Pauline tendency. So far as we are concerned, however, the point is unimportant. Those who assert the universalistic character of the episode generally deny its authenticity; most of those who accept it as historical deny its universalism.

The order to go and teach all nations, however, by no means carries us beyond strictly Messianic limits. Whilst the Jews expected the Messiah to restore the people of Israel to their own Holy Land and crown them with unexampled prosperity and peace, revenging their past sorrows upon their enemies, and granting them supremacy over all the earth, they likewise held that one of the Messianic glories was to be the conversion of the Gentiles to the worship of Jahveh. This is the burden of the prophets, and it requires no proof. The Jews, as the people with whom God had entered into Covenant, were first to be received into the kingdom. "Let the children first be filled,"[1] and then the heathen might partake of the bread. Regarding the ultimate conversion of the Gentiles, therefore, there was no doubt; the only questions were as to the time and the conditions of admission into the national fellowship. As to the time, there never had been any expectation that the heathen could be turned to Jahveh in numbers before the appearance of the

[1] Mk. viii. 27.

Messiah, but converts to Judaism had been made in all ages, and after the dispersion, especially, the influence of the Jews upon the professors of the effete and expiring religions of Rome, of Greece, and of Egypt was very great, and numerous proselytes adopted the faith of Israel,[1] and were eagerly sought for[2] in spite of the abusive terms in which the Talmudists spoke of them.[3] The conditions on the other hand were perfectly definite. The case of converts had been early foreseen and provided for in the Mosaic code. Without referring to minor points, we may at once say that circumcision was indispensable to admission into the number of the children of Israel.[4] Participation in the privileges of the Covenant could only be secured by accepting the mark of that Covenant. Very many, however, had adopted Judaism to a great extent, who were not willing to undergo the rite requisite to full admission into the nation, and a certain modification had gradually been introduced by which, without it, strangers might be admitted into partial communion with Israel. There were, therefore, two classes of proselytes,[5] the first called Proselytes of the Covenant or of Righteousness who were circumcised, obeyed the whole Mosaic law, and

[1] *Credner*, Das N. T., i. p. 72 f., 192 f., anm. 4; *von Döllinger*, Heidenthum u. Judenthum, 1857, p. 628 f.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 368 ff.; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., ii. p. 111 ff.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 239; *Schneckenburger*, Vorles. N. T. Zeitgesch., 1862, p. 67 ff.

[2] Mt. xxiii. 15.

[3] They were said to be "as a scab to Israel." Bab. Middah. fol. xiii. 2; *Lightfoot*, Horæ. Hebr. Works, xi. p. 282.

[4] Exod. xii. 48; Numb. ix. 14; cf. Ex. xii. 19, &c., &c.

[5] *Credner*, Das N. T., ii. p. 27 f.; *von Döllinger*, Heidenth. u. Judenth., p. 806; Christenthum u. Kirche, p. 49; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 379 f.; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., ii. p. 115 ff.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 286; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 382, note *b*; *Neander*, K. G. 2te Aufl., i. p. 113 ff.; *Schneckenburger*, N. T. Zeitg., p. 68 ff.; *Steiner*, Schenkel's Bib. Lex. s. v. Proselyten; *Smith's* Dictionary of the Bible, iii. s. v. Proselyte, &c.

were fully incorporated with Israel, and the other called Proselytes of the Gate,[1] or worshippers of Jahveh, who in the New Testament are commonly called οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν Θεόν, or οἱ εὐσεβεῖς. These had not undergone the rite of circumcision, and therefore were not participators in the Covenant, but merely worshipped the God of Israel,[2] and were only compelled to observe the seven Noachian prescriptions. These Proselytes of the Gate, however, were little more than on sufferance. They were excluded from the Temple, and even the Acts of the Apostles represent it to be pollution for a Jew to have intercourse with them: it requires direct Divine intervention to induce Peter to go to Cornelius, and to excuse his doing so in the eyes of the primitive Church.[3] Nothing short of circumcision and full observance of the Mosaic law could secure the privileges of the Covenant with Israel to a stranger, and in illustration of this we may again point to the Acts, where certain who came from Judæa, members of the primitive church, teach the Christians of Antioch: "Except he have been circumcised after the custom of Moses ye cannot be saved."[4]

[1] We need not discuss the chronology of this class.

[2] It is scarcely necessary to speak of the well-known case of Izates, King of Adiabene, related by Josephus. The Jewish merchant Ananias, who teaches him to worship God according to the religion of the Jews, is willing, evidently from the special emergency of the case and the danger of forcing Izates fully to embrace Judaism in the face of his people, to let him remain a mere Jahveh worshipper, only partially conforming to the Law, and remaining uncircumcised; but another Jew from Galilee, Eleazer, versed in Jewish learning, points out to him that, in neglecting circumcision, he breaks the principal point of the Law. Izates then has himself circumcised. *Josephus*, Antiq. xx. 2 § 3 f.

[3] Acts x. 2 ff, xi. 2 ff. Dr. Lightfoot says: "The Apostles of the circumcision, even St. Peter himself, had failed hitherto to comprehend the wide purpose of God. With their fellow-countrymen they still 'held it unlawful for a Jew to keep company with an alien' (Acts x. 28)." Galatians, p. 290.

[4] Acts xv. 1.

This will be more fully shown as we proceed. The conversion of the Gentiles was not, therefore, in the least degree an idea foreign to Judaism, but, on the contrary, formed an intimate part of the Messianic expectation of the later prophets. The condition, however, was the full acceptance of the Mosaic law, and admission to the privileges and promises of the Covenant through the initiatory rite.[1] That small and comparatively insignificant people, with an arrogance that would have been ridiculous if, in the influence which they have actually exerted over the world, it had not been almost sublime, not only supposed themselves the sole and privileged recipients of the oracles of God, as his chosen and peculiar people, but they contemplated nothing short of universal submission to the Mosaic code, and the supremacy of Israel over all the earth.

We are now better able to estimate the position of the Twelve when the death of their Master threw them on their own resources, and left them to propagate his Gospel as they themselves understood it. Born a Jew of the race of David, accepting during his life the character of the promised Messiah, and dying with the mocking title "King of the Jews" written upon his cross, Jesus had left his disciples in close communion with the Mosaism which he had spiritualized and enobled, but had not abolished. He himself had taught them that "it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness," and, from his youth upwards, had set them the example of

[1] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 109; *Credner*, Das N. T., ii. p. 20 f., 56 ff.; *von Döllinger*, Christ. u. Kirche, p. 49; *Ebrard*, zu Olshausen, Apg., p. 159 f.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 238 ff.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 24; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 158 ff.; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. 372 f.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 284 ff.; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. K., p. 141 f.; *Schliemann*, Die Clementinen, p. 378 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 43 ff.

enlightened observance of the Mosaic law. His precept had not belied his example, and whilst in strong terms we find him inculcating the permanence of the Law, it is certain that he left no order to disregard it. He confined his own preaching to the Jews; the first ministers of the Messiah represented the twelve tribes of the people of Israel; and the first Christians were of that nation, with no distinctive worship, but practising as before the whole Mosaic ritual. What Neander says of "many," may, we think, be referred to all: "That Jesus faithfully observed the form of the Jewish law served to them as evidence that this form should ever preserve its value."[1] As a fact, the Apostles and the early Christians continued as before assiduously to practise all the observances of the Mosaic law, to frequent the Temple[2] and adhere to the usual strict forms of Judaism.[3] In addition to the influence of the example of Jesus and the powerful effect of national habit, there were many strong reasons which obviously must to Jews have rendered abandonment of the law as difficult as submission to its full requirements must have been to Gentiles. Holding as they did the Divine origin of the Old Testament, in which the observance of the Law was inculcated on almost every page,

[1] Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 47.

[2] Acts ii. 46, iii. 1, v. 20, 42, xxi. 20—27, xxii. 17, &c., &c.

[3] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 49; *Bleek*, Hebräerbr., i. 1. p. 56 f.; *Credner*, Das N. T., ii. p. 20 ff.; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., ii. p. 360; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 365 f.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 281 f., 287 ff.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 285 f., 287, 300 f.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 202 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 33 f.; *Nicolas*, Études N. T., p. 237 f.; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 372 f., 377 f., 410; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 22 f.; Théol Chr., i. p. 290 ff.; *Réville*, Essais, p. 15, 19 f.; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. K., p. 124 f., 140 ff.; *Rothe*, Anfänge chr. Kirche, i. p. 142 f., 316 ff.; *Schliemann*, Clementinen, p. 371 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 52 ff.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 567 f.; *Zeller*, Gesch. chr. K., p. 5 f.; Vorträge, p. 21.

it would have been impossible, without counter-teaching of the most peremptory and convincing character, to have shaken its supremacy; but beyond this, in that theocratic community Mosaism was not only the condition of the Covenant, and the key of the Temple, but it was also the diploma of citizenship, and the bond of social and political life. To abandon the observance of the Law was not only to resign the privilege and the distinctive characteristic of Israel, to relinquish the faith of the Patriarchs who were the glory of the nation, and to forsake a divinely appointed form of worship, without any recognized or even indicated substitute, but it severed the only link between the individual and the people of Israel, and left him in despised isolation, an outcast from the community. They had no idea, however, that any such sacrifice was required of them. They were simply Jews believing in the Jewish Messiah, and they held that all things else were to proceed as before, until the glorious second coming of the Christ.[1]

The Apostles and primitive Christians continued to hold the national belief that the way to Christianity lay through Judaism, and that the observance of the law was obligatory and circumcision necessary to complete communion.[2] Paul describes with unappeased

[1] *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 33 f.

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 137 f.; *Credner*, Das N. T., ii. p. 20 ff., 26 ff; *von Döllinger*, Christ. u. Kirche, p. 48 f., 58, 62; *Hausrath*, N. T. Zeitg., ii. p. 406 ff.; in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 190 f.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 285 f., 290; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 200, 202 f.; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 377 f., 382 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 24, 668 f.; K. G., ii. p. 590 f.; *Nicolas*, Études N. T., p. 237 f.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 284 f.; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, p. 372 f.; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 22; Théol. Chr., i. p. 291 ff., 294, 307; ii. p. 343; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. Kirche, p. 147; *Schliemann*, Clementinen, p. 378 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 56 f.; *Zeller*, Gesch. chr. K. p. 5 f.; Vorträge, p. 204 ff. Cf. *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 242 ff; *Rothe* Anfänge chr. K., p. 142 ff., 315 ff.

irritation the efforts made by the community of Jerusalem, whose "pillars" were Peter, James, and John, to force Titus, a Gentile Christian, to be circumcised,[1] and even the Acts represent James and all the elders of the Church of Jerusalem as requesting Paul, long after, to take part with four Jewish Christians, who had a vow and were about to purify themselves and shave their heads and, after the accomplishment of the days of purification, make the usual offering in the Temple, in order to convince the "many thousands there of those who have believed and are all zealous for the law," that it is untrue that he teaches: "all the Jews who are among the Gentiles apostacy (ἀποστασίαν) from Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs," and to show, on the contrary, that he himself walks orderly and keeps the Law.[2] As true Israelites, with opinions fundamentally unchanged by belief that Jesus was the Messiah, they held that the Gospel was specially intended for the people of the Covenant, and they confined their teaching to the Jews.[3] A Gentile whilst still uncircumcised, even although converted, could not, they thought, be received on an

[1] Gal. ii. 3 ff. As we shall more fully discuss this episode hereafter, it is not necessary to do so here.

[2] Acts xxi. 18—26; cf. xv. i. Paul is also represented as saying to the Jews of Rome that he has done nothing "against the customs of their Fathers."

[3] Dr. Lightfoot says: "Meanwhile at Jerusalem some years past away before the barrier of Judaism was assailed. The Apostles still observed the Mosaic ritual; they still confined their preaching to Jews by birth, or Jews by adoption, the proselytes of the Covenant," &c. Paul's Ep. to Gal. p. 287. *Paley* says: "It was not yet known to the Apostles, that they were at liberty to propose the religion to mankind at large. That 'mystery,' as St. Paul calls it (Eph. iii. 3—6), and as it then was, was revealed to Peter by an especial miracle." A view of the Evidence, &c., ed. Potts, 1850. p. 228.

equality with the Jew, but defiled him by contact.[1] The attitude of the Christian Jew to the merely Christian Gentile, who had not entered the community by the portal of Judaism, was, as before, simply that of the Jew to the proselyte of the Gate. The Apostles could not upon any other terms have then even contemplated the conversion of the Gentiles. Jesus had limited his own teaching to the Jews, and, according to the first Gospel, had positively prohibited, at one time at least, their going to the Gentiles, or even to the Samaritans, and if there had been an order given to preach to all nations it certainly was not accompanied by any removal of the conditions specified in the Law.[2] It has been remarked that neither party, in the great discussion in the Church regarding the terms upon which Gentiles might be admitted to the privileges of Christianity, ever appealed in support of their views to specific instructions of Jesus on the subject.[3] The reason is intelligible enough. The Petrine party, supported as they were by the whole weight of the Law and of Holy Scripture, as well as by the example and tacit approval of the Master, could not have felt even that degree of doubt which precedes an appeal to authority.

[1] Acts x. 1 ff., 14, 28; xi. 1 ff.

[2] Dr. Lightfoot says: "The Master himself had left no express instructions. He had charged them, it is true, to preach the Gospel to all nations, but how this injunction was to be carried out, by what changes a national Church must expand into an universal Church, they had not been told. He had indeed asserted the sovereignty of the spirit over the letter; he had enunciated the great principle—as wide in its application as the law itself—that 'man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man.' He had pointed to the fulfilment of the law in the Gospel. So far he had discredited the law, but he had not deposed it or abolished it. It was left to the Apostles themselves under the guidance of the Spirit, moulded by circumstances and moulding them in turn, to work out the great change." St. Paul's Ep. to Gal. 286.

[3] *Gfrörer*, Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit, 1838, p. 386; Allg. K. G. i. p. 227 f.

The party of Paul, on the other hand, had nothing in their favour to which a specific appeal could have been made; but in his constant protest that he had not received his doctrine from man, but had been taught it by direct revelation, the Apostle of the Gentiles, who was the first to proclaim a substantial difference between Christianity and Judaism,[1] in reality endeavoured to set aside the authority of the Judaistic party by an appeal from the earthly to the spiritualized Messiah. Even after the visit of Paul to Jerusalem about the year 50, the elder Apostles still retained the views which we have shown to have been inevitable under the circumstances, and, as we learn from Paul himself, they still continued mere "Apostles of the Circumcision," limiting their mission to the Jews.[2]

The Apostles and the primitive Christians, therefore, after the death of their Master, whom they believed to be the Messiah of the Jews, having received his last instructions, and formed their final impressions of his views, remained Jews, believing in the continued obligation to observe the Law and, consequently, holding the initiatory rite essential to participation in the privileges of the Covenant. They held this not only as Jews believing in the Divine origin of the Old Testament and of the Law, but as Christians confirmed by the example and the teaching of their Christ, whose very coming was a substantial ratification of the ancient faith of Israel. In this position they stood when the

[1] *Baur*, N. T. Theologie, 1864, p. 128 ff.; K. G. i. p. 44 f.; *Credner*, Das N. T., i. p. 156 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Allg. K. G., i. p. 232 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl., p. 222 ff.; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus u. Petr., p. 236 f. et passim; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 369 ff.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 200 ff.; *Zeller*, Gesch. chr. K., p. 5 f.

[2] Gal. ii. 9.

Gospel, without their intervention, and mainly by the exertions of the Apostle Paul, began to spread amongst the Gentiles, and the terms of their admission came into question. It is impossible to deny that the total removal of conditions, advocated by the Apostle Paul with all the vehemence and warmth of his energetic character, and involving nothing short of the abrogation of the Law and surrender of all the privileges of Israel, must have been shocking not only to the prejudices but also to the deepest religious convictions of men who, although Christians, had not ceased to be Jews, and, unlike the Apostle of the Gentiles, had been directly and daily in contact with Jesus, without having been taught such revolutionary principles. From this point we have to proceed with our examination of the account in the Acts of the relation of the elder Apostles to Paul, and the solution of the difficult problem before them.

CHAPTER V.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. STEPHEN THE MARTYR.

BEFORE the Apostle of the Gentiles himself comes on the scene, and is directly brought in contact with the Twelve, we have to study the earlier incidents narrated in the Acts, wherein, it is said, the emancipation of the Church from Jewish exclusiveness had already either commenced or been clearly anticipated. The first of these which demands our attention is the narrative of the martyrdom of Stephen. This episode, although highly interesting and important in itself, might, we consider, have been left unnoticed in connection with the special point now engaging our attention, but such significance has been imparted to it by the views which critics have discovered in the speech of Stephen, that we cannot pass it without attention. If this detention be, on the one hand, to be regretted, it will on the other be compensated by the light which may be thrown on the composition of the Acts.

We read[1] that in consequence of murmurs amongst the Hellenists against the Hebrews, that their widows were neglected in the daily distribution of alms, seven deacons were appointed specially to attend to such ministrations. Amongst these, it is said, was Stephen,[2]

[1] Acts vi. 1 ff.

[2] It is unnecessary to discuss whether Stephen was a Jew of Palestinian

"a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit." Stephen, it appears, by no means limited his attention to the material interests of the members of the Church, but being "full of grace and power, did great wonders and signs (*τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα*) amongst the people." "But there arose certain of those of the synagogue which is called (the synagogue) of the Libertines[1] and Cyrenians and Alexandrians and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen; and they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake. Then they suborned men who said: We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and God. And they stirred up the people and the elders and the scribes, and came upon him, and seized him, and brought him to the Council, and set up false witnesses who said: This man ceaseth not to speak words against the holy place and the law; for we have heard him say, that Jesus, this Nazarene, shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered to us." The high-priest asks him: Are these things so? And Stephen delivers an address, which has since been the subject of much discussion amongst critics and divines. The contents of the speech taken by themselves do not present any difficulty, so far as the sense is concerned, but regarded as a reply to the accusations brought against him by the false witnesses, the defence of Stephen has perhaps been interpreted in a greater variety of ways than any other part of the New Testament. Its shadowy outlines have been used as a setting for the pious thoughts of subsequent

or Hellenist extraction. The historic elements in the episode are too slight to render such a point either important or capable of determination.

[1] The Libertines were probably Jewish freedmen, or the descendants of freedmen, who had returned to Jerusalem from Rome.

generations, and every imaginable intention has been ascribed to the proto-martyr, every possible or impossible reference detected in the phrases of his oration. This has mainly arisen from the imperfect nature of the account in the Acts, and the absence of many important details which has left criticism to adopt that "divinatorisch-combinatorische" procedure which is so apt to evolve any favourite theory from the inner consciousness. The prevailing view, however, amongst the great majority of critics of all schools is, that Stephen is represented in the Acts as the forerunner of the Apostle Paul, anticipating his universalistic principles, and proclaiming with more or less of directness the abrogation of Mosaic ordinances and the freedom of the Christian Church.[1] This view was certainly advanced by Augustine, and lies at the base of his famous saying: "Si sanctus Stephanus sic non orasset, ecclesia Paulum non haberet,"[2] but it was first clearly enunciated by Baur, who subjected the speech of Stephen to detailed analysis,[3] and his interpretation has to a large extent been adopted even by apologists. It must be clearly understood that adherence to this reading of the aim and meaning of the speech, as it is given in the Acts, by no means involves an admission of its authenticity, which, on the contrary, is impugned by Baur himself, and by a large number of independent critics. We have the misfortune of differing most materially from the prevalent view regarding the contents of the speech, and we maintain that, as it stands in the Acts, there is not a

[1] *Holsten*, we think rightly, denies that Stephen can be considered in any way the forerunner of Paul. Zum Ev. Paulus u. Petr. p. 52 anm. **, p. 253 anm. *.

[2] Sermo. i. in fest. St. Stephani.

[3] De orationis habitæ a Stephano consilio, 1829; Paulus, u. s. w., i. 49 ff.

word in it which can be legitimately construed into an attack upon the Mosaic law, or which anticipates the Christian universalism of Paul. Space, however, forbids our entering here upon a discussion of this subject, but the course which we must adopt with regard to it renders it unnecessary to deal with the interpretation of the speech. We consider that there is no reason for believing that the discourse put into the mouth of Stephen was ever actually delivered, but on the contrary that there is every ground for holding that it is nothing more than a composition by the Author of the Acts. We shall endeavour clearly to state the reasons for this conclusion.

With the exception of the narrative in the Acts, there is no evidence whatever that such a person as Stephen ever existed. The statements of the Apostle Paul leave no doubt that persecution against the Christians of Jerusalem must have broken out previous to his conversion, but no details are given, and it can scarcely be considered otherwise than extraordinary, that Paul should not in any of his own writings have referred to the protomartyr of the Christian Church, if the account which is given of him be historical. It may be argued that his own share in the martyrdom of Stephen made the episode an unpleasant memory, which the Apostle would not readily recall. Considering the generosity of Paul's character on the one hand, however, and the important position assigned to Stephen on the other, this cannot be admitted as an explanation, and it is perfectly unaccountable that, if Stephen really be a historical personage, no mention of him occurs elsewhere in the New Testament.

Moreover, if Stephen was, as asserted, the direct forerunner of Paul, and in his hearing enunciated

sentiments like those ascribed to him, already expressing much more than the germ—indeed the full spirit—of Pauline universality, it would be passing strange that Paul not only tacitly ignores all that he owes to the proto-martyr, but vehemently protests: "But I make known unto you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached by me is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was taught it, but by revelation of Jesus Christ."[1] There is no evidence whatever that such a person exercised any such influence on Paul.[2] One thing only is certain, that the speech and martyrdom of Stephen made so little impression on Paul that, according to Acts, he continued a bitter persecutor of Christianity, "making havoc of the Church."

The statement, vi. 8, that "Stephen, full of grace and power, did great wonders and signs among the people" is not calculated to increase confidence in the narrative as sober history; and as little is the assertion, vi. 15, that "all who sat in the Council, looking stedfastly on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel." This, we think, is evidently an instance of Christian subjective opinion made objective.[3] How, we might ask, could it be known to the writer that all who sat at the Council saw this? Neander replies that probably it is the evidence of members of the Sanhedrin of the impression made on them by the aspect of Stephen.[4] The intention of the writer, however, obviously is to describe a supernatural pheno-

[1] Gal. i. 11, 12.

[2] It is further very remarkable, if it be assumed that the vision, Acts vii. 55, actually was seen, that, in giving a list of those who have seen the risen Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 5—8), which he evidently intends to be complete, he does not include Stephen.

[3] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 65, anm.; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 90; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 152. Cf. *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 191.

[4] Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 68.

menon,[1] and this is in his usual manner in this book, where miraculous agency is more freely employed than in any other in the Canon. The session of the Council commences in a regular manner,[2] but the previous arrest of Stephen,[3] and the subsequent interruption of his defence, are described as a tumultuous proceeding, his death being unsanctioned by any sentence of the Council.[4] The Sanhedrin, indeed, could not execute any sentence of death without the ratification of the Roman authorities,[5] and nothing is said in the narrative which implies that any regular verdict was pronounced; but, on the contrary, the tumult described in v. 57 f. excludes such a supposition. Olshausen[6] considers that, in order to avoid any collision with the Roman power, the Sanhedrin did not pronounce any formal judgment, but connived at the execution which some fanatics carried out. This explanation, however, is inadmissible, because it is clear that the members of the Council themselves, if also the audience,

[1] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 66; *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 130; *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 64 f.; *Hackett*, Acts, p. 96; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. 52; *Lightfoot*, Works, viii. p. 416; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 158; *Robinson*, Acts, p. 33; *Weizsäcker*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., v. p. 387; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 152.

[2] vi. 13 ff., vii. 1.

[3] vi. 11, 12.

[4] *Humphrey* (on the Acts, p. 668 f.), with a few others, thinks there was a regular sentence. *De Wette* (K. Erkl. Apostelgesch., p. 114) thinks it more probable that there was a kind of sentence pronounced, and that the reporter, not having been an eye-witness, does not quite correctly state the case.

[5] John xviii. 31. Cf. *Origen*, Ad. African. § 14; *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 82 f.; *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 62; *von Döllinger*, Christ. u. Kirche, p. 456 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 338; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 72 f.; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 125; *Weizsäcker*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., v. p. 387; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 150. It is argued, however, that the trial of Stephen probably took place just after the recall of Pontius Pilate, either in an interval when the Roman Procurator was absent, or when one favourable to the Jews had replaced Pilate. A most arbitrary explanation, for which no ground, but the narrative which requires defence, can be given.

[6] Die Apostelgesch., 125.

attacked and stoned Stephen.[1] The actual stoning[2] is carried out with all regard to legal forms;[3] the victim being taken out of the city,[4] and the witnesses casting the first stone,[5] and for this purpose taking off their outer garments. The whole account, with its singular mixture of utter lawlessness and formality, is extremely improbable,[6] and more especially when the speech itself is considered. The proceedings commence in an orderly manner, and the high priest calls upon Stephen for his defence. The council and audience listen patiently and quietly to his speech, and no interruption takes place until he has said all that he had to say, for it must be apparent that when the speaker abandons narrative and argument and breaks into direct invective, there could not have been any intention to prolong the address, as no expectation of calm attention after such denunciations could have been natural. The tumult cuts short the oration precisely where the author had exhausted his

[1] *Meyer*, Apg., p. 193; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette's Apg.; p. 114 f.

[2] It is said both in v. 58 and 59 that "they stoned" him. The double use of the term λιθοβόλουν has called forth many curious explanations. *Heinrichs* (ad vii. 57, p. 205), and after him *Kuinoel* (iv. p. 288), explain the first as meaning only that they prepared to stone him, or that they wantonly threw stones at him on the way to the place of execution. Olshausen (on vii. 57—60, p. 125) considers the first to be a mere anticipation of the second more definitely described stoning. So also *Meyer* (on vii. 57, p. 193). *Bleek* (Einl. N. T., p. 341 f.) conjectures that the author only found it stated generally in the written source which he uses, as in v. 58, that they cast Stephen out of the city and stoned him, and that, from mere oral tradition, he inserted the second λιθοβόλουν, v. 59, for the sake of what is there related about Saul.

[3] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 83; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 195; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. 69; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 193; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 365 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 114 f.; *Weizsäcker*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., v. p. 387.

[4] Levit. xxiv. 14. [5] Deut. xvii. 7.

[6] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 62 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 338; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 114 f.; *Schneckenburger*, Stud. u. Krit., 1855, p. 526 f.; *Weizsäcker*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., v. p. 387; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 149 ff.

subject, and by temporary lawlessness overcomes the legal difficulty of a sentence which the Sanhedrin, without the ratification of the Roman authority, could not have carried out. As soon as the tumult has effected these objects, all becomes orderly and legal again; and, consequently, the witnesses can lay their garments "at a young man's feet whose name was Saul." The principal actor in the work is thus dramatically introduced. As the trial commences with a supernatural illumination of the face of Stephen, it ends with a supernatural vision, in which Stephen sees heaven opened, and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God. Such a trial and such an execution present features which are undoubtedly not historical.

This impression is certainly not lessened when we find how many details of the trial and death of Stephen are based on the accounts in the Gospels of the trial and death of Jesus.[1] The irritated adversaries of Stephen stir up the people and the elders and scribes, and come upon him and lead him to the Council.[2] They seek false witness against him;[3] and these false witnesses accuse him of speaking against the temple and the law.[4] The false witnesses who are set up against Jesus with similar testimony, according to the first two Synoptics, are strangely omitted by the third. The reproduction of this trait here has much that is suggestive. The high priest asks: "Are these things so?"[5] Stephen, at

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 64 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 338; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 115 f.; *Schneckenburger*, Stud. u. Krit., 1855, p. 526 f.; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 584; *Weizsäcker*, in Schenk. Bib. Lex., v. p. 388.

[2] Acts vi. 12; cf. Luke xxii. 66, Mt. xxvi. 57.

[3] Acts vi. 11; cf. Mt. xxvi. 59, Mk. xiv. 55.

[4] Acts vi. 13 f.; cf. Mt. xxvi. 60 f., Mk. xiv. 57 f.

[5] The words in Acts vii. 1 are: εἶπεν δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεύς· Εἰ (ἄρα) ταῦτα οὕτως

the close of his speech, exclaims: "I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." Jesus says: "Henceforth shall the Son of Man be seated on the right hand of the power of God." [1] Whilst he is being stoned, Stephen prays, saying: "Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit;" and, similarly, Jesus on the cross cries, with a loud voice: "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit; and, having said this, he expired." [2] Stephen, as he is about to die, cries, with a loud voice: "Lord lay not this sin to their charge; and when he said this he fell asleep;" and Jesus says: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." [3] These two sayings of Jesus are not given anywhere but in the third Synoptic,[4] and their imitation by Stephen, in another work of the same Evangelist, is a peculiarity which deserves attention. It is argued by apologists [5] that nothing is more natural than that the first martyrs should have the example of the suffering Jesus in their minds, and die with his expressions of love and resignation on their lips. On the other hand, taken along with other most suspicious circumstances which we have already pointed out, and with the fact, which we shall presently demonstrate, that the speech of Stephen is nothing more

ἔχει; In Matth. xxvi. 63,—ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἐξορκίζω σε . . . ἵνα ἡμῖν εἴπῃς εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς . . . In Luke xxii. 66 . . λέγοντες· Εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἰπὸν ἡμῖν. cf. *Zeller*, Die Apostelg. p. 153, anm. 2.

[1] Acts vii. 56, Luke xxii. 69.

[2] . . . λέγοντα· Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. Acts vii. 59.

καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. Luke xxiii. 46.

[3] . . . ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· Κύριε, μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν· καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐκοιμήθη. Acts vii. 60.

[4] ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν· Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν. Luke xxiii. 34.

[5] *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 73, anm. 2; *Meyer*, Apostelgesch., 195, &c., &c.

than a composition by the Author of Acts, the singular analogies presented by this narrative with the trial and last words of Jesus in the Gospels seem to us an additional indication of its inauthenticity. As Baur[1] and Zeller[2] have well argued, the use of two expressions of Jesus only found in the third Synoptic is a phenomenon which is much more naturally explained by attributing them to the Author, who of course knew that Gospel well, than to Stephen who did not know it at all.[3] The prominence which is given to this episode of the first Christian martyrdom is intelligible in itself, and it acquires fresh significance when it is considered as the introduction of the Apostle Paul, whose perfect silence regarding the proto-martyr, however, confirms the belief which we otherwise acquire, that the whole narrative and speech, whatever unknown tradition may have suggested them, are, as we have them, to be ascribed to the Author of the Acts.

On closer examination, one of the first questions which arises is: how could such a speech have been reported? Although Neander[4] contends that we are not justified in asserting that all that is narrated regarding Stephen in the Acts occurred in a single day, we think it cannot be doubted that the intention is to describe the arrest, trial, and execution as rapidly following each other on the same day. "They came upon him, and seized him, and

[1] Paulus, i. p. 64, anm. 1. [2] Apostelgesch., 152.

[3] *Neander* admits that the narrative in Acts is wanting in clearness and intuitive evidence of details, although he does not think that this at all militates against the trustworthiness of the whole. (Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 68, anm.) *Bleek* points out that viii. 1—3, which is so closely connected with this episode, shows a certain confusion and want of clearness, and supposes the passage interpolated by the author into the original narrative of which he made use. (Einl. N. T., p. 342.)

[4] Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 68, anm.

brought him to the Council, and set up false witnesses, who said," &c.[1] There is no ground here for interpolating any imprisonment, and if not, then it follows clearly that Stephen, being immediately called upon to answer for himself, is, at the end of his discourse, violently carried away without the city to be stoned. No preparations could have been made even to take notes of his speech, if upon any ground it were reasonable to assume the possibility of an intention to do so; and indeed it could not, under the circumstances, have been foreseen that he should either have been placed in such a position, or have been able to make a speech at all. The rapid progress of all the events described, and the excitement consequent on such tumultuous proceedings, render an ordinary explanation of the manner in which such a speech could have been preserved improbable, and it is difficult to suppose that it could have been accurately remembered, with all its curious details, by one who was present. Improbable as it is, however, this is the only suggestion which can possibly be advanced. The majority of apologists suppose that the speech was heard and reported by the Apostle Paul himself,[2] or at least that it was communicated or written down either by a member of the Sanhedrin, or by some one who was present.[3] As there is no information on the point, there is ample scope for imagination, but when we come to consider its linguistic and other peculiarities, it must be borne in

[1] Acts vi. 12 f.

[2] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. proleg., p. 11; *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 131; *Ebrard*, Ev. Gesch., p. 690; zu Olsh. Apg., p. 112; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. 56; *Lüger*, Zweck, u. s. w., der Rede des Stephanus, 1838, p. 31 f.; *Riehm*, De font. Act. Apost., p. 195 f.; *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., Acts, p. 73 f.

[3] *Bleek*, Einl., p. 348; Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1036; *Heinrichs*, Act. Apost., i. p. 24, ii. p. 387 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 162; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 112.

mind that the extreme difficulty of explaining the preservation of such a speech must be an element in judging whether it is not rather a composition by the Author of Acts. The language in which it was delivered, again, is the subject of much difference of opinion, many maintaining that it must have originally been spoken in Aramaic,[1] whilst others hold that it was delivered in Greek.[2] Still, a large number of critics and divines of course assert that the speech attributed to Stephen is at least substantially authentic. As might naturally be expected in a case where negative criticism is arrayed against a canonical work upheld by the time-honoured authority of the church, those who dispute its authenticity are in the minority.[3] It is maintained by the latter that the language is more or less that of the writer of the rest of the work, and that the speech in fact as it lies before us is a later composition by the Author of the Acts of the Apostles.

Before examining the linguistic peculiarities of the speech, we may very briefly point out that, in the course of the historical survey, many glaring contradictions of the statements of the Old Testament occur.[4] Stephen says

[1] *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 191; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 168; *Michaelis*, Einl., ii. p. 1181 f.; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 114. Cf. *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., Acts, p. 66.

[2] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 67; *Heinrichs*, Act. Apost., i. p. 177; *Stier*, Die Reden d. Ap., i. p. 172, anm. *; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 93; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 93; *Weizsäcker*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., v. p. 390.

[3] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 61 ff.; N. T. Theol., p. 338; *B. Bauer*, Apg., p. 87 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 524; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 102 f., anm. 3; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 63 ff., 70 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 92 ff.; *Weizsäcker*, in Schenk. B. Lex., v. p. 390 f; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 149 ff., 510 ff. Cf. *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 235 f.; *Eichhorn*, Einl., ii. p. 36 ff., 39 f.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 338.

[4] The Bishop of Lincoln says of those who venture to observe these: "The allegations in question, when reduced to their plain meaning, involve the assumption, that the Holy Ghost, speaking by St. Stephen (who was 'full of the Holy Spirit'), *forgot* what He Himself had written

(vs. 2, 3) that the order to Abraham to leave his country was given to him in Mesopotamia before he dwelt in Haran; but, according to Genesis (xii. 1 ff.) the call is given whilst he was living in Haran. The speech (v. 4) represents Abraham leaving Haran after the death of his father, but this is in contradiction to Genesis, according to which[1] Abraham was 75 when he left Haran. Now, as he was born when his father Terah was 70,[2] and Terah lived 205 years,[3] his father was only 145 at the time indicated, and afterwards lived 60 years. In v. 5 it is stated that Abraham had no possession in the promised land, not even so much as to set his foot on; but, according to Genesis,[4] he bought the field of Ephron in Machpelah. It is said (v. 14) that Jacob went down into Egypt with 75 souls, whereas, in the Old Testament, it is repeatedly said that the number was 70.[5] In v. 16, it is stated that Jacob was buried in Schechem in a sepulchre bought by Abraham of the sons of Emmor in Schechem, whereas in Genesis[6] Jacob is said to have been buried in Machpelah; the sepulchre in Schechem, in which

in the Book of Genesis; and that His Memory is to be refreshed by biblical commentators of the nineteenth century! This kind of criticism is animated by a spirit very alien from that Christian temper of reverential modesty, gentleness, and humility, which are primary requisites for the discovery and reception of truth. *Mysteries are revealed to the meek* (Eccles. iii. 19). *Them that are meek shall He guide in judgment; and such as are gentle, them shall He learn His way* (Ps. xxv. 8). But such a spirit of criticism seems willing to accept any supposition, however fanciful, except that of its own fallibility! It is ready to allege that St. Luke is in error in saying that St. Stephen was full of the Holy Ghost. It is ready to affirm that St. Stephen was forgetful of the elements of Jewish history. . . . . No wonder that it is given over by God to a reprobate mind." Greek Test., Acts of the Apostles, p. 66 f.

[1] Gen. xii. 4. [2] xi. 26. [3] xi. 32.

[4] xxiii. 4 ff., 17 ff.

[5] Gen. xlvi. 27, Exod. i. 5, Deut. x. 22. It must be added that in the last two passages the version of the lxx. also gives 75 including the sons of Joseph.

[6] xlix. 29, l. 13.

the bones of Joseph were buried, was not bought by Abraham, but by Jacob.[1] Moses is described (v. 22) as mighty in words, but in Exodus[2] he is said to be the very reverse, and Aaron in fact is sent with him to speak words for him. These are some of the principal variations. It used to be argued that such mistakes were mere errors of memory, natural in a speech delivered under such circumstances and without preparation,[3] and that they are additional evidence of its authenticity, inasmuch as it is very improbable that a writer deliberately composing such a speech could have committed them. It is very clear, however, that the majority of these are not errors of memory at all, but either the exegesis prevailing at the time amongst learned Jews, or traditions deliberately adopted, of which many traces are elsewhere found.[4]

The form of the speech is closely similar to other speeches found in the same work. We have already, in passing pointed out the analogy of parts of it to the address of Peter in Solomon's porch, but the speech of Paul at Antioch bears a still closer resemblance to it, and has been called "a mere echo of the speeches of Peter and Stephen."[5] We must refer the reader to our general comparison of the two speeches of Peter and Paul in question,[6] which sufficiently showed, we think,

[1] Joshua xxiv. 32. [2] iv. 10 ff.

[3] Even *de Wette* says: "The numerous historical errors are remarkable; they may most probably be ascribed to an unprepared speech." K. Erkl. Apostelgesch., p. 93.

[4] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 67 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 235 f.; *Ebrard*, zu Olsh. Apg., p. 115 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl., ii. p. 39 f.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 193, anm. 2: *Fielmoser*, Einl., p. 314 f.; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. 57 ff.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 170 f.; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 117 f.

[5] *Schneckenburger*, Zweck der Apostelgesch., p, 130.

[6] See back, p. 85 ff.

that they were not delivered by independent speakers, but on the contrary that they are nothing more than compositions by the author of the Acts. These addresses which are such close copies of each other, are so markedly cast in the same mould as the speech of Stephen, that they not only confirm our conclusions as to their own origin, but intensify suspicions of its authenticity. It is impossible, without reference to the speeches themselves, to shew how closely that of Paul at Antioch is traced on the lines of the speech of Stephen, and this resemblance is much greater than can be shown by mere linguistic examination. The thoughts correspond where the words differ. There is a constant recurrence of words, however, even where the sense of the passages is not the same, and the ideas in both bear the stamp of a single mind. We shall not attempt fully to contrast these discourses here, for it would occupy too much space, and we therefore content ourselves with giving a few illustrations, begging the reader to examine the speeches themselves.

Stephen.	Paul and Peter.
vii. 2. Men, brethren, fathers, hear.	xiii. 15. Men, brethren . . . . . 16. Men, Israelites, and ye that fear God, hear.
	Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ . . . ἀκούσατε.
	xxii. 1. Men, brethren, and fathers, hear. . . .
Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε . . .	*Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε.*
The God of glory (*ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης*)[1] appeared to our father (*τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν*) Abraham when he was in (*ὄντι ἐν τῇ* M.) Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in (*κατοικῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐν*) Haran, &c.	xiii. 17. The God of this people (*ὁ θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου*) Israel chose our fathers (*τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν*) and exalted the people in their sojourn in the land of Egypt (*ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ*) . . .

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 8, *κύριος τῆς δόξης*; cf. lxx. Ps. xxviii. 3.

STEPHEN.	PAUL AND PETER.
6. . . . that his seed should be a sojourner in a strange land (*πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ*) . . .	
5 . . . and to his seed . . . (*καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ*)[1]	
8. And he gave him (Abraham) a covenant . . . (*καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην . . .*) of circumcision.[2]	
22. (Moses) was mighty in his words and deeds (*ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ*).	
32. I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. (*Ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ.*)	
36. This (Moses) brought them (the people *τὸν λαὸν*) out (*ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς*) having worked wonders and signs[3] in the land of Egypt (*ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ*) and in the Red Sea, and in the wilderness forty years (*ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα*). v. 42. . . . forty years in the wilderness. . . . (*ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*)	
37. This is the Moses who said unto the children of Israel: A prophet shall God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me. . . .	iii. 22. Moses indeed said:[5] A prophet shall the Lord our God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me, &c., &c.
42. . . . God delivered them up to serve the host of heaven (*ὁ θεὸς παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς λατρεύειν, κ. τ. λ.*).	(Rom i. 24. . . . God delivered them up . . to uncleanness (*παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς . . . εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, κ. τ. λ.* cf. 26. . . . *παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας* . . . . 28. . . . *παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν.* . . .)).
	iii. 25. Ye are the children . . . of the covenant (*τῆς διαθήκης*) which God made with your fathers, saying unto Abraham: And in thy seed (*καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου*), &c., &c.
	(Luke xxiv. 19. Jesus . . mighty in deed and word (*δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ . . .*))
	iii. 13. The God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, the God of our fathers. (*ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν . . . .*)
	xiii. 17. . . . and exalted the people (*τὸν λαὸν*) in their sojourn in the land of Egypt (*ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ*), and with a high arm brought them out of it (*ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς*), 18. and for about the time of forty years[4] (*τεσσερακονταέτη*) nourished them in the wilderness. (*ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.*)

[1] Compare with this verse Rom. iv. 13; Gal. iii. 16, 29.

[2] Cf. Rom. iv. 11, *καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς.*

[3] . . . *ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα* . . . ii. 22. . . . *τέρασιν καὶ σημείοις οἷς ἐποίησεν.* . . . .

[4] vii. 23 reads . . . . *τεσσερακονταέτης χρόνος* . . . . and xiii. 18 . . . . *τεσσερακονταέτη χρόνον* . . . and again vii. 23, *ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ* . . . 1 Cor. ii. 9, *ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη.* . . .

[5] The authorized version, on the authority of several important MSS.

Stephen.	Paul and Peter.
45. Which also our fathers . . . brought in with Joshua when they took possession of the Gentiles (*τῶν ἐθνῶν*) whom God drave out before the face of our fathers, unto the days of David,	xiii. 19. And he destroyed seven nations (*ἔθνη*) in the land of Canaan,[1] and divided their land to them by lot.
46. Who found (*εὗρε*) favour with God. . . .	22 . . . he raised up unto them David as king, to whom also he bare witness and said: I found (*εὗρον*) David, a man after mine own heart, &c., &c.
48. Howbeit, the Most High dwelleth not in what is made with hands (*οὐχ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ·*) even as the prophet saith: 49. The heaven (*ὁ οὐρανός*) is my throne, and the earth (*ἡ γῆ*) is my footstool. 50. Did not my hand make all these things? (*Οὐχὶ ἡ χείρ μου ἐποίησεν πάντα ταῦτα;*)	xvii. 24f. The God that made the world and all things therein (*ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ*), he being Lord of heaven and earth (*οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς*) dwelleth not in temples made with hands (*οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ*) neither is served by men's hands (*χειρῶν*), &c., &c., &c.
51. Ye uncircumcised in hearts . . . (*ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίαις. . . .*)	(Rom. ii. 29. Circumcision is of the heart, in spirit (*περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι κ. τ. λ. . . .*))
52. Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? and they killed (*ἀπέκτειναν*) them which announced before of the coming of the righteous One (*τοῦ δικαίου*), of whom ye have become betrayers and murderers (*φονεῖς*).	xxii. 14. . . . the righteous One (*τὸν δίκαιον*). . .
	iii. 14. But ye denied the holy and righteous One (*τὸν δίκαιον*) and desired a murderer (*ἄνδρα φονέα*) to be granted unto you, 15. and killed (*ἀπεκτείνατε*) the Prince of Life, &c., &c.
53. Ye received the law at the arrangements of angels . . . (*ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων . . . .*)	(Gal. iii. 19. What then is the law? It was added . . .; being arranged by means of angels . . . (*τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; προσετέθη . . . διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων . . .*))
54. And hearing these things they were cut to their hearts (*ἀκούοντες δὲ ταῦτα διεπρίοντο*), and gnashed their teeth upon him.	v. 33. When they heard they were cut (to their hearts) (*οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες διεπρίοντο*) and took counsel to slay them.

It is argued that the speech of Stephen bears upon it

adds "unto the fathers" "*πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας*," but the balance of evidence is decidedly against the words.

[1] vii. 11. Then came a famine upon all Egypt and Canaan.

the stamp of an address which was actually delivered.[1] We are not able to discover any special indication of this. Such an argument, at the best, is merely the assertion of personal opinion, and cannot have any weight. It is quite conceivable that an oration actually spoken might lose its spontaneous character in a report, and on the other hand that a written composition might acquire oratorical reality from the skill of the writer. It would indeed exhibit great want of literary ability if a writer, composing a speech which he desires to represent as having actually been spoken, altogether failed to convey some impression of this. To have any application to the present case, however, it must not only be affirmed that the speech of Stephen has the stamp of an address really spoken, but that it has the character of one delivered under such extraordinary circumstances, without premeditation and in the midst of tumultuous proceedings. It cannot, we think, be reasonably asserted that a speech like this is peculiarly characteristic of a man suddenly arrested by angry and excited opponents, and hurried before a council which, at its close, rushes upon him and joins in stoning him. Unless the defence attributed to Stephen be particularly characteristic of this the argument in question falls to the ground. On the contrary, if the speech has one feature more strongly marked than another, it is the deliberate care with which the points referred to in the historical survey are selected and bear upon each other, and the art with which the climax is attained. In showing, as we have already done, that the speech betrays the handywork of the Author of the Acts, we have to a large extent disposed of any claim

[1] *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 131; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 409; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 161 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 65 f., anm. 1.

to peculiar individuality in the defence, and the linguistic analysis which we shall now make will conclusively settle the source of the composition. We must point out here in continuation that, as in the rest of the work, all the quotations in the speech are from the Septuagint, and that the author follows that version even when it does not fairly represent the original.[1]

We may now proceed to analyse the language of the whole episode from vi. 9 to the end of the seventh chapter, in order to discover what linguistic analogy it bears to the rest of the Acts and to the third Synoptic, which for the sake of brevity we shall simply designate "Luke." With the exception of a very few words in general use, every word employed in the section will be found in the following analysis, based upon Bruder's 'Concordance,'[2] and which is arranged in the order of the verses, although for greater clearness the whole is divided into categories.

We shall commence with a list of the words in this section which are not elsewhere used in the New Testament. They are as follows:—*ὑποβάλλειν*, vi. 11; *συγκινεῖν*, vi. 12; *ὠνεῖσθαι*, vii. 16;[3] *ἔκθετος*, vii. 19, but *ἐκτιθέναι*, occurs several times in Acts, see below, vii. 21; *ἀμύνεσθαι*, vii. 24; *συναλλάσσειν*, vii. 26; *διαδέχεσθαι*, vii. 45, this word, which is common amongst

[1] vii. 42, 43; cf. ii. 25, 28, xiii. 41, xv. 16, 17.

[2] We have already referred to works in which a very complete analysis of the language of the Acts and Gospel has been made, and we may here again point out: *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 388 ff.; *Lekebusch*, Apostelgesch., p. 35 ff.; *Holtzmann*, Die synopt. Evv., p. 302 ff. The last-named has chiefly reference to the Gospel. We have made our analysis of the speech of Stephen, as compared with the rest of Acts and Gospel, independently, but we are likewise indebted to the works above named, to the first two especially.

[3] *καθώς*, of time, vii. 17, is rare; but the cod. A. reads *ὡς*, which occurs 30 times in Acts, 19 times in Luke, and some 20 times elsewhere in N. T.

Greek writers,[1] is used in lxx. 2 Chron. xxxi. 12; ἔλευσις, vii. 52. These nine words are all that can strictly be admitted as ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, but there are others, which, although not found in any other part of the Acts or of the Gospel, occur in other writings of the New Testament, and which must here be noted. βλάσφημος, vi. 11, occurring 1 Tim. i. 13, 2 Tim. iii. 2, 2 Pet. ii. 11, Rev. xiii. 5; βλασφημεῖν, however, is used four times in Acts, thrice in Luke, and frequently elsewhere, and βλασφημία in Luke v. 21. ψευδής, vi. 13, used Rev. ii. 2, xxi. 8; ἀλλάττειν, vi. 14, Rom. i. 23, 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52, Gal. iv. 20, Heb. i. 12, almost purely a Pauline word; ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι, vii. 5, elsewhere fourteen times; μετατιθέναι, vii. 16, also Gal. i. 6, Heb. vii. 12, xi. 5 twice (lxx. Gen. v. 24), Jude 4; καταπονεῖν (καταπονούμενος), vii. 24, also 2 Pet. ii. 7; μάχεσθαι, vii. 26, also John vi. 52, 2 Tim. ii. 24, James iv. 2; λόγιον, vii. 38, also Rom. iii. 2, Heb. v. 12, 1 Pet. iv. 11; ὑπήκοος, vii. 39, also 2 Cor. ii. 9, Phil. ii. 8; διαταγή, vii. 53, also Rom. xiii. 2, cf. Gal. iii. 19, but the writer makes use of διατάσσειν, see vii. 44, below; ἀποτιθέναι, vii. 58, also Rom. xiii. 12, Eph. iv. 22, 25, Col. iii. 8, Heb. xii. 1, James i. 21, 1 Pet. ii. 1. If we add these ten words to the preceding, the proportion of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα is by no means excessive for the 67 verses, especially when the peculiarity of the subject is considered, and it is remembered that the number of words employed in the third Gospel, for instance, which are not elsewhere found, greatly exceeds that of the other Gospels, and that this linguistic richness is characteristic of the author.

There is another class of words which may now be

[1] Cf. *Kuinoel*, l. c.

dealt with: those which, although not elsewhere found either in the Acts or Gospel, are derived from the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. The author makes exclusive use of that version, and in the historical survey, of which so large a portion of the speech is composed, his mind very naturally recalls its expressions even where he does not make direct quotations, but merely gives a briet summary of its narratives. In the following list where words are not clearly taken from the Septuagint version[1] of the various episodes referred to, the reasons shall be stated :—

μετοικίζειν, vii. 4, and 43, where it is quoted from Amos v. 27.

κατάσχεσις, vii. 5, and 45; Gen. xvii. 8, and Numb. xxxii. 5, &c., &c.

πάροικος, vii. 6 from. Gen. xv. 13; again, vii. 29 from Exod. ii. 22; it also occurs Eph. ii. 19, 1 Pet. ii. 11.

ἀλλότριος, vii. 6 (*πάροικος ἐν γῇ Ἀλλοτρίᾳ*); cf. Gen. xv. 13 f., from which verses 6, 7 are taken; Gen. xv. 13 reads *οὐκ ἰδίᾳ* for *ἀλλοτρίᾳ*, but Ex. ii. 22, and xviii. 3, which are equally to the point, have *πάροικος ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ*, cf. Ps. cxxxvi. 4.

χόρτασμα, vii. 11, used Gen. xlii. 27 in narrating the visit of Joseph's brethren to Egypt for provender; also Gen. xxiv. 25, 32, &c., &c.; *χορτάζειν* occurs in Luke vi. 21, ix. 17, xv. 16, xvi. 21.

σιτίον, vii. 12; in Gen. xlii. 1, 2, which is quoted, *σῖτος* is used, and it recurs Acts xxvii. 38, thrice in Luke, and nine times in other parts of the N. T. The plural *σιτία*, which is the reading of the best MSS. in this place, however, does not elsewhere occur in the N. T. *σῖτα* is the reading of some other Codices, and likewise *σῖτος*, so the word must be considered doubtful.

ἀναγνωρίζεσθαι, vii. 13, *Gen.* xlv. 1.

κατασοφίζεσθαι, vii. 19, *Exod.* i. 10.

ἀστεῖος, vii. 20, *Exod.* ii. 2, also used Heb. xi. 23.

στεναγμός, vii. 34, *Exod.* ii. 24, *cf.* iii. 7; also used Rom. viii. 26.

λυτρωτής, vii. 35, *Ps.* lxxvii. 35, speaking of the delivery of Israel from Egypt; rest of passage from Ex. iii. 2, xiv. 19.

μοσχοποιεῖν, vii. 41, *Ex.* xxxii. 4 . . . *ποιεῖν μόσχον*—also *ver.* 8 and *Ps.* cv. 19—from which this word is coined.

σκήνωμα, vii. 46 (. . . *εὑρεῖν σκήν. τῷ θεῷ Ἰακώβ*) *Ps.* cxxxi. 5 (*εὕρω . . . . σκήν. τῷ θεῷ Ἰακώβ*); also 2 Pet. i. 13, 14.

---

[1] vii. 6, 7, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 40, 42, 43, 47, 49, 50, are almost wholly direct quotations from the lxx. We have referred to any words in these verses requiring notice.

σκληροτράχηλος, vii. 51, *Exod.* xxxiii. 3, 5, *Deut.* ix. 6, 13.

ἀπερίτμητος, vii. 51 (ἀπ. καρδίαις καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν),[1] *Ezeck.* xliv. 9 (ἀπ. καρδίᾳ . . . . ἀπ. σαρκί) also v. 7, *Jerem.* ix. 26 (ἀπ. καρδίᾳ . . . ἀπ. σαρκί) *Jerem.* vi. 10 (ἀπερίτμητα τὰ ὦτα αὐτῶν); Rom. ii. 29.

ἀντιπίπτειν, vii. 51, used *Numb.* xxvii. 14 in regard to the rebellion of the Israelites in the wilderness.

βρύχειν, vii. 54 (ἔβρυχον τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐπ' αὐτόν); *Ps.* xxxiv. 16 (ἔβρυξαν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τοὺς ὀδόντας), *Ps.* xxxvi. 12 (βρύξει ἐπ' αὐτὸν τοὺς ὀδ.); cf. Matth. viii. 12, &c., &c.

We shall now, by way of disposing of them, take the words which require little special remark, but are used as well in the rest of the Acts and in the Gospel as in other writings of the New Testament:—

ἰσχύειν, vi. 10, xv. 10, xix. 16, 20, xxv. 7, xxvii. 16; Luke eight times, rest of N. T. 15 times.

ἀνθιστάναι, vi. 10, xiii. 8; Luke xxi. 15; rest 11 times.

σοφία, vi. 10, 3, vii. 10, 22; six times in Luke, 19 times by Paul,[2] 22 times elsewhere.

πρεσβύτερος (Jewish), vi. 12 and other 6 times; 4 times in Luke, frequently elsewhere.

τόπος, vi. 13 and 18 times; Luke 20 times, rest frequently.

μάρτυς, vi. 13 and 12 times; Luke xxiv. 48; rest 20 times.

παραδιδόναι, vi. 14, vii. 42 and 12 times; Luke 17 times, rest frequently.

πρόσωπον, vi. 15 twice, vii. 45, and 9 times; Luke 15, rest frequently.

ὡσεί, vi. 15 and 8 times; Luke 10, rest 17 times.

δόξα, vii. 2, 55, xii. 23, xxii. 11; Luke 13, rest frequently. (ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης, *Ps.* xxviii. 3; *cf.* xxiii. 7, 8, 9, 10; cf. Cor. ii. 8, κύριος τῆς δόξης.)

σπέρμα, vii. 5, 6, iii. 25, xiii. 23; Luke i. 55, xx. 28, Paul 17, rest 21 times.

τέκνον, vii. 5, ii. 39, xiii. 33, xxi. 5, 21; Luke 14 times, rest frequently.

δουλεύειν, vii. 7, *Gen.*[3] xv. 14, Acts xx. 19; Luke xv. 29, xvi. 13 twice, Paul 11, rest 9 times.

διαθήκη, vii. 8, *Gen.* xvii. 9, 10, 11, Acts iii. 25; Luke i. 72, xxii. 20, Paul 6, rest 20 times.

---

[1] Codices E H P read τῇ καρδίᾳ.

[2] We shall use this expression to indicate the use of words in the Epistles to the Romans, 1 and 2 to the Corinthians, and to the Galatians.

[3] When a passage of Old Testament is referred to it will be understood that the lxx. version is intended, and that the word is derived from it. When this is not clear, and the word is only used in the passage indicated, it will be placed within brackets.

γενναν, vii. 8, 20, 29, ii. 8, xiii. 33, xxii. 3, 28; Luke 4 times, rest frequently.

ἀποδιδόναι, vii. 9, *Gen.* xxxvii. 28, 29, Acts v. 8; Heb. xii. 16; in other senses Acts 2, Luke 8, rest 35 times.

θλῖψις, vii. 10, 11, xi. 19, xiv. 22, xx. 23; Paul 15, rest 25 times.

χάρις, vii. 10 and 16 times; Luke 8, Paul 61, and rest 72 times.

καθίστημι, vii. 10, *Gen.* xxxix. 4, 5, xli. 41, 43; Acts vi. 3, vii. 27, 35, *Exod.* ii. 14; xvii. 15; Luke xii. 14, 42, 44; rest 16 times.

λιμός, vii. 11, *Gen.* xli. 54, Acts xi. 28; Luke 4, rest 6 times.

πρῶτον, adv. vii. 12, iii. 26, xi. 26, xiii. 46, xv. 14, xxvi. 20; Luke 10 times, rest frequently.

φανερός, vii. 13, iv. 16; Luke viii. 17 twice; Paul 7, rest 10 times.

δεύτερος, vii. 13 and 4 times; Luke 3, rest 36 times: ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ, not elsewhere, but cf. Luke xii. 38 ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φυλακῇ.

τελευτᾶν, vii. 15, ii. 29; Luke vii. 2; elsewhere 10 times.

χρόνος, vii. 17, 23, and 15 times; Luke 7 times, rest often.

ἐπαγγελία, vii. 17, i. 4, ii. 33, 39, xiii. 23, 32, xxiii. 21, xxvi. 6; Luke xxiv. 49, Paul 20; rest 24 times.

ὁμολογεῖν, vii. 17, xxiii. 8, xxiv. 14; Luke xii. 8 twice, rest 21 times.

καιρός, vii. 20, and 8 times; Luke 13 times, rest frequently.

ἀδικεῖν, vii. 24, *Ex.* ii. 13; Acts vii. 26, 27, xxv. 10, 11; Luke x. 19; rest 13.

σωτηρία, vii. 25, iv. 12, xiii. 26, 47, xvi. 17, xxvii. 34; Luke i. 69, 71, 77, xix. 9, Paul 10, rest 26 times.

συνιέναι, vii. 25 twice, xxviii. 26, 27; Luke ii. 50, viii. 10, xviii. 34, xxiv. 45, rest 16 times.

εἰρήνη, vii. 26, ix. 31, x. 36, xii. 20, xv. 33, xvi. 36, xxiv. 3; Luke 14 times, rest frequently.

πλησίον, vii. 27, *Ex.* ii. 13; Luke x. 27, 29, 36, rest 13 times.

φεύγειν, vii. 29, xxvii. 30; Luke iii. 7, viii. 34, xxi. 21, rest 27 times.

ἔρημος, ἡ, vii. 30, 36, 38, 42, 44, *Ex.* iii. 1, xvi. 1, &c., &c., Acts xiii. 18, xxi. 38; Luke 8 times, rest 20 times.

ἔτος, vii. 30, 6, 36, 42, *Gen.* xv. 13, *Ex.* xvi. 35, *Amos* v. 25, &c., and 7 times; Luke 15, rest 23.

θαυμάζειν, vii. 31, ii. 7, iii. 12, iv. 13, xiii. 41; Luke 13 times, rest frequently.

τολμᾶν, vii. 32, v. 13; Luke xx. 40, Paul 7, rest 6 times.

λύειν, vii. 33, *Ex.* iii. 5, Acts ii. 24, xiii. 25, 43, xxii. 30, xxiv. 26, xxvii. 41; Luke 7 times, rest often.

ἀρνεῖσθαι, vii. 35, iii. 13, 14, iv. 16; Luke viii. 45, ix. 23, xii. 9, xxii. 57, rest 24 times.

ἐκκλησία, vii. 38, *Deut.* xxxii. 1, and Acts 23 times; Paul 39, rest 49 times.

θυσία, vii. 41, 42, *Amos* v. 25; Luke ii. 24, xiii. 1, rest 25 times.

εἴδωλον, vii. 41 (*Ex.* xx. 4, *Numb.* xxv. 2 . . . . εἰς τὰς θυσίας τῶν εἰδώλων αὐτ.), Acts xv. 20; Paul 6, rest 3.

λατρεύειν, vii. 42, *Deut.* iv. 19, *Ex.* xx. 5, &c., &c., Acts xxiv. 14, xxvi. 7, xxvii. 23; Luke 3, rest 13 times.

προσφέρειν, vii. 42, *Amos* v. 25; Acts viii. 18, xxi. 26; Luke 5 times, rest frequently.

τύπος, vii. 43, *Amos* v. 26, Acts vii. 44, *Ex.* xxv. 9, 40, Acts xxiii. 25; Paul 4 times, rest 9.

προσκυνεῖν, vii. 43; *Deut.* iv. 19, xvii. 3; Acts viii. 27, x. 25, xxiv. 11; Luke iv. 7, 8, xxiv. 52, rest frequently.

σκηνή, vii. 43, *Amos* v. 26; Acts vii. 44, xv. 16, *Amos* ix. 11; Luke ix. 33, xvi. 9, rest 16 times.

μαρτύριον, vii. 44, *Ex.* xxvii. 21; Acts iv. 33; Luke v. 14, ix. 5, xxi. 13, rest 15.

αἰτεῖν, vii. 46, iii. 2, 14, ix. 2, xii. 20, xiii. 21, 28, xvi. 29, xxv. 3, 15; Luke 11 times, rest frequently.

οἰκοδομεῖν, vii. 47, 3 *Kings* vi. 2, viii. 20, 1 *Chron.* xxviii. 6; Acts vii. 49, *Isaiah*, lxvi. 1; Acts iv. 11, ix. 31, xxii. 32; Luke 11, rest frequently.

ναός,[1] vii. 48, xvii. 24, xix. 24; Luke 4, rest 39 times.

ποῖος, vii. 49, *Isaiah*, lxvi. 1; Acts, iv. 7, xxiii. 34; Luke 8, rest 22 times.

οὖς, vii. 51, *Jerem.* vi. 10; Acts, vii. 57, xi. 2, xxviii. 27 twice; Luke 7, rest 25 times.

διώκειν, vii. 52, and 8 times; Luke xvii. 23, xxi. 12, Paul 14, rest 19 times.

φυλάσσειν, vii. 53, xii. 4, xvi. 4, xxi. 24, 25, xxii. 20, xxiii. 35, xxviii. 16; Luke 6, rest 17 times.

θεωρεῖν, vii. 56, and 13 times; Luke 7, rest 36 times.

ἐκβάλλειν, vii. 58, ix. 40, xiii. 50, xvi. 37, xxvii. 38; Luke 21 times, rest frequently.

ἔξω, vii. 58, and 10 times; Luke 11 times, rest frequently.

ἱμάτιον, vii. 58, and 7 times; Luke 10 times, rest frequently.

We shall now give the words which may either be regarded as characteristic of the author of the Acts and Gospel, or the use of which is peculiar or limited to him:—

συζητεῖν, vi. 9, ix. 29; Luke xxii. 23, xxiv. 15, Mark 6 times.

ῥῆμα with λαλεῖν, vi. 11, 13, x. 44, xi. 14, xiii. 42; Luke ii. 17, 50, rest 6 times: without λαλ. Acts 9, Luke 17, rest 32 times.

ἐφιστάναι, vi. 12, iv. 1, x. 17, xi. 11, xii. 7, xvii. 5, xxii. 13, 20, xxiii. 11, 27, xxviii. 2; Luke 7 times, 1 Thess. v. 3, 2 Tim. iv. 26, only.

συναρπάζειν, vi. 12, xix. 29, xxvii. 15; Luke viii. 29, only.

συνέδριον, vi. 12, and 13 times; Luke xxii. 66; Mt. 3 times, Mk. 3, John 1, only.

παύεσθαι (followed by particip.), vi. 13, v. 42, xiii. 10, xx. 31, xxi, 32; Luke v. 4, rest 3 times; otherwise Acts xx. 1; Luke viii. 24, xi. 1, rest 3 times.

---

[1] The oldest codices omit *ναοῖς* from vii. 48.

καταλύειν, vi. 14, v. 38, 39; Luke xxi. 6, cf. ix. 12, xix. 7, Paul 3, Mt. 5, Mk. 3 times.

ἔθος, vi. 14, xv. 1, xxv. 16; Luke i. 9, ii. 42, xxii. 39, rest 2; τὰ ἔθη, vi. 14, xvi. 21, xxi. 21, xxvi. 3, xxviii. 17, only.

καθέζεσθαι, vi. 15, xx. 9; Luke ii. 46, Mt. xxvi. 55, John iv. 6, xi. 20, xx. 12, only.

κατοικεῖν, vii. 2, 4 twice, 48, i. 19, 20, ii. 5, 9, 14, iv. 16, ix. 22, 32, 35, xi. 29, xiii. 27, xvii. 24, 26, xix. 10, 17, xxii. 12,; Luke twice, rest 25 times.

συγγένεια, vii. 3, *Gen.* xii. 1, cf. *Ex.* xii. 21; Acts vii. 14; Luke i. 61, only.

κἀκεῖθεν, vii. 4, xiii. 21, xiv. 26, xvi. 12, xx. 15, xxi. 1, xxvii. 4, 12 (?), xxviii. 15, Mk. x. 1 (?) only.

κληρονομία, vii. 5, xx. 32, both with δοῦναι; Luke xii. 13, xx. 14, rest 10 times.

δοῦναι, vii. 5, 38, v. 31, xix. 31, xx. 32; Luke 8, rest 9 times.

βῆμα, vii. 5 (οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός) *Deut.* ii. 5 (οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός), xii. 21, xviii. 12, 16, 17, xxv. 6, 10, 17; Paul twice, rest twice.

περιτομή, vii. 8, x. 45, xi. 2; Paul 23, rest 11 times.

περιτέμνειν, vii. 8, *Gen.* xxi. 4; Acts xv. 1, 5, 24, xvi. 3, xxi. 21; Luke i. 59, ii. 21, Paul 8, rest 2 times.

πατριάρχης, vii. 8, 9, ii. 29, Heb. vii. 4, only.

ζηλοῦν, vii. 9, *Gen.* xxxvii. 11; Acts xvii. 5; Paul 9, rest 2 times.

ἐξαιρεῖν, vii. 10, 34, *Exod.* iii. 8; Acts xii. 11, xxiii. 27, xxvi. 17; Paul 3, rest 2 times.

ἐναντίον, vii. 10, *Gen.* xli. 37; viii. 32, *Isaiah* liii. 7; Luke i. 8, xx. 26, xxiv. 19, Mk. ii. 12 (?) only.

ἡγούμενος, vii. 10, xiv. 12, xv. 22, cf. xxvi. 2; Luke xxii. 26, Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24.

ἐξαποστέλλειν, vii. 12, ix. 30, xi. 22, xii. 11, xiii. 26, xvii. 14, xxii. 21; Luke 3 times, Gal. iv. 4, 6, only.

γένος, vii. 13, 19, iv. 6, 36, xiii. 26, xvii. 28, 29, xviii. 2, 24; Paul 5, rest 7 times.

μετακαλεῖσθαι, vii. 14, x. 32, xx. 17, xxiv. 25, only.

ψυχή (man), vii. 14, *Deut.* x. 22; Acts ii. 41, 43, iii. 23, xxvii. 37; Rom. xiii. 1, 2 Pet. ii. 14, Rev. xvi. 3. Constr. cf. Luke xiv. 31.

μνῆμα, vii. 16, ii. 29; Luke viii. 27, xxiii. 23, xxiv. 1, rest 3 times.

τιμή (price), vii. 16, iv. 34, v. 2, 3, xix. 19; 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23, Mt. xxvii. 6, 9, only.

ἀργύριον, vii. 16, iii. 6, viii. 20, xix. 19, xx. 33; Luke ix. 3, xix. 15, 23, xxii. 5, rest 11 times.

ἐγγίζειν, vii. 17, ix. 3, x. 9, xxi. 32, xxii. 6, xxiii. 15; Luke 18, rest 19 times.

αὐξάνειν, vii. 17, *Exod.* i. 7; Acts vi. 7, xii. 24, xix. 20; Luke i. 80, ii. 40, xii. 27, xiii. 19, rest 4 and in other senses 10 times.

πληθύνειν, vii. 17, *Exod.* i. 7; Acts vi. 7, ix. 31, xii. 24, rest 6 times.

βρέφος, vii. 19; Luke i. 41, 44, ii. 12, 16, xviii. 15; 2 Tim. iii. 15, 1 Pet. ii. 2, only.

κακοῦν, vii. 19, *Exod.* i. 11; Acts vii. 6, *Gen.* xv. 13; Acts xii. 1, xiv. 2, xviii. 10, 1 Pet. iii. 13, only.

ζωογονεῖν, vii. 19, *Exod.* i. 17, 18, 22; Luke xvii. 33, 1 Tim. vi. 13, only.

ἀνατρέφειν, vii. 20, 21, xxii. 3, only.

μήν, vii. 20, xviii. 11, xix. 8, xx. 3, xxviii. 11; Luke 5, rest 8 times.

ἐκτιθέναι, vii. 21, xi. 4, xviii. 26, xxviii. 23, only.

ἀναιρεῖσθαι (de tollente liberos), vii. 21, *Exod.* ii. 5: ἀναιρεῖν, vii. 28 twice, ii. 23, v. 33, 36, ix. 23, 24, 29, x. 39, xii. 2, xiii. 28, xvi. 27, xxii. 20, xxiii. 15, 21, 27, xxv. 3, xxvi. 10; Luke xxii. 2, xxiii. 32, rest 3 times.

παιδεύειν, vii. 22, xxii. 3; 1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 25, Tit. ii. 12, only; παιδ. (castigare), Luke xxiii. 16, 22, rest 6 times.

δυνατός, vii. 22, ii. 24, xi. 17, xviii. 24, xx. 16, xxv. 5; Luke xxiv. 19, i. 49, xiv. 31, xviii. 27; Paul 12, rest 13 times.

ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, vii. 23, vi. 3, xv. 36; Mt. xxv. 36, 43, James i. 27: of God, Acts xv. 14, Luke i. 68, 78, vii. 16; Heb. ii. 6, only.

πληροῦν (of time), vii. 23, 30, ix. 23, xxiv. 27; Luke xxi. 24; Mk. i. 15, John vii. 8; (of fulness), Acts, ii. 2, 28, v. 3, 28, xiii. 52, Luke ii. 40, iii. 5, rest 24 times.

ἐκδίκησις, vii. 24; Luke xviii. 7, 8, xxi. 22, all with ποιεῖν except the last; rest 5 times.

πατάσσειν, vii. 24, *Exod.* ii. 12; Acts xii. 7, 23; Luke xxii. 49, 50; rest 5 times.

νομίζειν, vii. 25, viii. 20, xiv. 19, xvi. 13, 27, xvii. 29, xxi. 29; Luke ii. 44, iii. 23, rest 6 times.

ἐπιέναι, vii. 26, xxiii. 11, xvi. 11, xx. 15, xxi. 18, only. See again below.

ἀπωθεῖν, vii. 27, 39, xiii. 46; Rom. xi. 1, 2, 1 Tim. i 19, only.

ἄρχων, vii. 27, 35 twice, *Ex.* ii. 14; Acts iii. 17, iv. 5, 8, 26, xiii. 27, xiv. 5, xvi. 19, xxiii. 5; Luke 8, rest 18 times.

δικαστής, vii. 27, 35, *Exod.* ii. 14; Luke xii. 14, only.

ὅραμα, vii. 31, *Exod.* iii. 3; Acts ix. 10, 12, x. 3, 17, 19, xi. 5, xii. 9, xvi. 9, 10, xviii. 9; Mt. xvii. 9, only.

κατανοεῖν, vii. 31, 32, xi. 6, xxvii. 39; Luke vi. 41, xii. 24, 27, xx. 23; Rom. iv. 19; Mt. vii. 3; rest 4 times.

ἔντρομος, vii. 32, xvi. 29, both with γενόμενος; Heb. xii. 21, only.

σύν, vii. 35, and 50 times; Luke 26, Paul 22, rest 31 times.

ἐξάγειν, vii. 36, 40, v. 19, xii. 17, xiii. 17, xvi. 37, 39, xxi. 38; Luke xxiv. 50; rest 4 times.

δέχεσθαι, vii. 38, 59, iii. 21, viii. 14, xi. 1, xvii. 11, xxi. 17, xxii. 5, xxviii. 21; Luke 15, rest 30 times.

στρέφειν, vii. 39, 42, xiii. 46; Luke 8, rest 9 times.

ἀνάγειν, vii. 41, ix. 39, xii. 4, xvi. 34; Luke ii. 22, iv. 5, xxii. 66 (3 Kings iii. 15, 2 Chron. xxix. 21), Rom. x. 7, Heb. xiii. 20, Mt. iv. 1, only. In sense of putting off to sea, Acts 13 times; Luke once, only.

εὐφραίνειν, vii. 41, ii. 26; Luke xii. 19, xv. 23, 24, 29, 32, xvi. 19; Rom. xv. 10, 2 Cor. ii. 2, Gal. iv. 27, Rev. thrice, only.

στρατιά, vii. 42; Luke ii. 13, only; (3 Kings xxii. 19).

ἀναλαμβάνειν, vii. 43, *Amos* v. 26; Acts i. 2, 11, 22, x. 16, xx. 13, 14, xxiii. 31, rest 5 times.

διατάσσειν vii. 44, xxiv. 23; xviii. 2, xx. 13, xxiii. 31; Luke iii. 13, viii. 55, xvii. 9, 10; Paul 5 times; Tit. i. 5, only.

εἰσάγειν, vii. 45, ix. 8, xxi. 28, 29, 37, xxii. 24; Luke ii. 27, xiv. 21, xxii. 54; rest twice, only.

ἐξωθεῖν, vii. 45, xxvii. 39 only; (*Jerem.* xxiv. 9, &c., &c.).

προπορεύεσθαι, vii. 47, *Ex.* xxxii. 1; Luke i. 76, only.

ὕψιστος, absolute, vii. 48 (cf. xvi. 17, ii. 33, v. 31, xxiv. 49); Luke i. 32, 35, 76, vi. 35 (cf. ii. 14, viii. 28, xix. 38) only. Cf. Mk. v. 7, Heb. vii. 1.

χειροποίητος, vii. 48, xvii. 24; Mk. xiv. 58, Eph. ii. 11, Heb. ix. 11, 24 only. Other compounds of *χείρ* used by the author only: *χειραγωγεῖν*, ix. 8, xxii. 11; *χειραγωγός*, xiii. 11. *χειροτονεῖν*, xiv. 23 and 2 Cor. viii. 9 only.

προκαταγγέλλειν, vii. 52, iii. 18, 24, only; (2 Cor. ix. 5 much too doubtful to quote).

δίκαιος, absolute, vii. 52, iii. 14, xxii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 18 (cf. James v. 6) only.

προδότης, vii. 52; Luke vi. 16, 2 Tim. iii. 4, only.

φονεύς, vii. 52, iii. 14, xxviii. 4; Mt. xxii. 7, 1 Pet. iv. 15, Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15, only.

διαπρίειν, vii. 54, v. 33, only; (1 *Chron.* xx. 3).

ὑπάρχειν, vii. 55, and 25 times; Luke 7, Paul 9, rest 6 times.

ἀτενίζειν εἰς, vii. 55, vi. 15, i. 10, iii. 4, xi. 6, xiii. 9; 2 Cor. iii. 7, 13 only; *ἀτ. τινί*, iii. 12, x. 4, xiv. 9, xxiii. 1; Luke iv. 20, xxii. 56, only.

πλήρης, vii. 55, vi. 3, 5, 8, ix. 36, xi. 24, xiii. 10, xix. 28; Luke iv. 1, v. 12; rest 7 times.

διανοίγειν, vii. 56, xvi. 14, xvii. 3; Luke ii. 23, xxiv. 31, 32, 45, Mk. ii. 34, 35, only.

συνέχειν, vii. 57, xviii. 5, xxviii. 8; Luke iv. 38, viii. 37, 45, xii. 50, xix. 43, xxii. 63, rest thrice only.

ὁρμᾶν, vii. 57, xix. 29; Luke viii. 33, Mt. viii. 32, Mk. v. 13, only.

ὁμοθυμαδόν, vii. 57, i. 14, ii. 1, 46, iv. 24, v. 12, viii. 6, xii. 20, xv. 25, xviii. 12, xix. 29; Rom. xv. 6, only.

λιθοβολεῖν, vii. 58, 59, xiv. 5; Luke xiii. 34, rest 5 times; (*Ex.* xix. 13).

νεανίας, vii. 58, xx. 9, xxiii. 17, 18, 22, only.

ἐπικαλεῖσθαι, vii. 59 and 19 times; Luke xxii. 3; Paul 5, rest 5 times.

κοιμᾶσθαι, (of dying) vii. 60, xiii. 36; Paul 6, rest 7 times. Otherwise, Acts xii. 6; Luke xxii. 45; Matth. xxviii. 13.

To this very remarkable list of words we have still to add a number of expressions which further betray the author of the Acts and Gospel:—

vi. 10. *καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυον ἀντιστῆναι τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ᾧ ἐλάλει.* Luke xxi. 15. *ἐγὼ γὰρ δώσω ὑμῖν στόμα καὶ σοφίαν, ᾗ οὐ δυνήσονται ἀντιστῆναι . . . πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι ὑμῖν.*

vi. 12. The participle *ἐπιστάς* added to a finite verb: xvii. 5, xxii. 13, xxiii. 11, 27; Luke ii. 38, iv. 39, x. 40.

vi. 13, *ῥήματα λαλῶν κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ τοῦ νόμου.* xxi. 28 . . . . *κατὰ τοῦ . . . . νόμου καὶ τοῦ τόπου (τοῦ ἁγίου)*[1] *τούτου . . . . διδάσκων, . . . καὶ κεκοίνωκεν τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον.* Cf. Mt. xxiv. 15.

vi. 14, *Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος*, ii. 22, iii. 6, iv. 10, xxii. 8, xxvi. 9; Luke xviii. 37, xxiv. 19; Mt. 2, Mk. 1, John 3 times.

vii. 2, *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε*, xxii. 1 the same; *ἄνδ. ἀδελφοί* i. 16, ii. 29, 37, vii. 2, 26, xiii. 15, 26, 38, xv. 7, 13, xxiii. 1, 6, xxviii. 17, and with *ἀκούσατε* added in ii. 22, xiii. 16; *ἄνδρες* alone with name of place or people, i. 11, ii. 14, 22, iii. 12, v. 35, xiii. 16, xvii. 22, xix. 35, xxi. 28; *ἀνήρ* with name, v. 1, viii. 9, 27, ix. 12, x. 28, xi. 20, xxii. 3.

vii. 2, *πρὶν ἤ*, with infinitive and accusative ii. 20; Luke xxii. 61; Mt. i. 18, Mk. xiv. 30; with conjunct. and optat. xxv. 16, Luke ii. 26, xxii. 34.

vii. 3, *πρὸς*, with accusative after *εἰπεῖν*, i. 7, ii. 29, 37, iii. 22, iv. 8, 19, 23, v. 9, 35, viii. 20, ix. 10, 15, x. 21, xii. 8, 15, xv. 7, 36, xviii. 6, 14, xix. 2 twice, 3, xxi. 37, xxii. 8, 10, 21, 25, xxiii. 3; = 30 times; Luke upwards of 70 times, cf. Mt. iii. 15 (? ?), Mk. 2, John 11 times, only.

vii. 4, *γῇ*, with name of country without article, (cf. 11), vii. 29, 36, 40, xiii. 17, 19; Mt. 6, rest 2 times.

,, *μετὰ τό*, followed by infinitive, i. 3, x. 41, xv. 13, xix. 21, xx. 1; Luke xii. 5, xxii. 20.

vii. 6, *μετ' αὐτόν*, xix. 4; xiii. 25, *μετ' ἐμέ*.

vii. 9, *καὶ ἦν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ*, *Gen.* xxxix. 2, cf. 21, 23; x. 38, . . . *ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ*. Cf. John iii. 2.

vii. 10, *οἶκος*, family, vii. 42, ii. 36, x. 2, xi. 14, xvi. 15, 31, xviii. 8; Luke 7 times, rest 16; *ὅλος ὁ οἶκος*, Acts vii. 10, ii. 2, xviii. 8.

vii. 17, *αὐξάνειν καὶ πληθύνειν*, vi. 7, xii. 24.

vii. 18, *ἄχρις οὗ κ. τ. λ.*, xxvii. 33; cf. Luke xxi. 24 (? ?); Paul 4, rest 3 times.

vii. 19, *τοῦ ποιεῖν*. The use of the genitive *τοῦ* before a verb in the infinitive, iii. 2, 12, viii. 40, ix. 15, x. 25, 47, xiii. 47, xiv. 9, 18, xv. 20, xviii. 10, xx. 3, 20, 27, 30, xxi. 12, xxiii. 15, 20, xxvi. 18 twice, xxvii. 1, 20, = 23 times; Luke 25 times, rest 36.

vii. 22, *ἦν δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις*. xviii. 24, *δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς*· ,, Luke xxiv. 19, *δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ*.

[1] The words between brackets are found in the Codices A, C, and others, but are omitted by other ancient authorities.

vii. 23 . . . τεσσερακονταέτης χρόνος . . . . xiii. 18 . . . τεσσερακονταέτη χρόνον.

vii. 23 . . . ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ . . . 1 Cor. ii. 9 . . . "ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη" . . . cf. Luke xxiv. 38; cf. Acts x. 9; ἀναβαίνειν, Acts 20 times, Luke 9 times, rest frequently. καρδία occurs in Acts 21, Luke 24 times, rest frequently.

,, υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ, 37, v. 21, ix. 15, x. 36; Luke i. 16, Paul 3, rest 4 times.

vii. 24, ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν . . . Luke xviii. 7 and 8 . . . ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν.

vii. 25, νομίζειν, with accusative and infinitive, xiv. 19, xvi. 13, 27, xvii. 29; only once used otherwise xxi. 29; so Luke ii. 44; rare elsewhere.

,, συνιέναι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὅτι . . . Mt. xvii. 13; τότε συνῆκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι . . .

,, διὰ χειρός, ii. 23, v. 12, xi. 30, xiv. 3, xv. 23, xix. 11, 26; ἐν χειρί, vii. 35.

vii. 26, τῇ τε ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ . . . xxiii. 11, τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτί. τῇ ἐπιούσῃ without a substantative, xvi. 11, xx. 15, xxi. 18. ἐπιέναι does not occur in any other writing of the N. T. The τε in this passage may not be sufficiently certain, but it occurs some 140 times in Acts, 8 in Luke, and only 46 times in the rest of the N. T.

vii. 28, ὃν τρόπον, *Ex.* ii. 14; Acts i. 11, xv. 11, xxvii. 25; Luke xiii. 34, Mt. xxiii. 37, 2 Tim. iii. 8; otherwise τρόπος 6 times.

vii. 29, ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ, viii. 1, ix. 37, xiv. 1, xix. 1, xxii. 17; Luke 32 times, rest 9.

vii. 30, ἐν φλογί . . . Luke xvi. 24, ἐν τῇ φλογὶ ταύτῃ, only.

vii. 33, λῦσον τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου, *Ex.* iii. 5; Acts xiii. 25, τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν λῦσαι.—ὑπόδημα, Luke iii. 16, x. 4, xv. 22, xx. 35, rest 4 times.

vii. 34, καὶ νῦν, iii. 17, x. 5, xiii. 11, xvi. 37, xx. 22, 25, xxii. 16, xxiii. 21, xxvi. 6; elsewhere 12 times.

vii. 36, ἐξήγαγεν αὐτούς, absol. v. 19, Mk. xv. 20.

vii. 38, πατέρες ἡμῶν, vii. 11, 12, 15, 19, 39, 44, 45 twice, 51, 52, iii. 13, 25, v. 30, xiii. 17, 32, 36, xv. 10, xxii. 14, xxvi. 6, xxviii. 25.

vii. 38, ἐδέξατο λόγια ζῶντα . . . Rom. iii. 2 . . . τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ; cf. John vi. 51, Heb. iv. 12, v. 12, x. 20; Acts viii. 14 . . . δέδεκται τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ . . . xi. 1 . . . ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ . . . xvii. 11 . . . ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον . . .

vii. 41, ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν . . . Rev. ix. 20 . . . ἐκ τῶν ἔργων τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν, cf. Heb. i. 10 (*Ps.* ci. 25, cxxxiv. 15).

vii. 42, στρατιὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Luke ii. 13, . . . στρατιᾶς οὐρανίου, nowhere else in N. T. 3 Kings xxii. 19 . . . στρατιὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ . . .

,, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν . . . i. 20, γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν.

vii. 45, ἀπὸ προσώπου, iii. 19, v. 41; Rev. vi. 16, xii. 14, xx. 11, only.

vii. 46, *ὃς εὗρεν χάριν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ* . . . Luke i. 30, *εὗρες γὰρ χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*; cf. 2 Tim. i. 18 (*Gen.* xxxiii. 10).

,, *ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, iv. 19, x. 31, 33, cf. viii. 21, x. 4; Luke i. 6, 19, xii. 6, xvi. 15.

vii. 55, *ἑστώς* for *ἑστηκώς*, vii. 56, iv. 14, v. 23, 25, xvi. 9, xxi. 40, xxii. 25, xxiv. 21, xxv. 10; Luke 4 times.

,, *πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου*, ; vi. 5, *πλήρης* . . . *πνεύματος ἁγίου* . . . xi. 24, *πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου* . . . vi. 3 . . . *πλήρεις πνεύματος* . . . cf. 8, ix. 36, *πλήρης ἔργων ἀγαθῶν* . . . cf. xiii. 10, xix. 28; Luke iv. 1, *πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου*, cf. v. 12. Not elsewhere in N. T.

vii. 56, *θεωρῶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς διηνοιγμένους*;[1] x. 11, *θεωρεῖ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγμένον*.

vii. 57, *φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*, 60, viii. 7, xiv. 10, xvi. 28, xxvi. 24; Luke 7 times, Rev. 19, rest 5 times. *κράξαντες φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*, Acts vii. 57, 60, Mt. xxvii. 50; *κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*, Rev. vi. 10; *ἔκραξαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*, cf. Mk. i. 26, v. 7, Acts xxiv. 21, Rev. vii. 2, 10, x. 3, xiv. 15, xviii. 2, xix. 17.

vii. 58, *παρὰ τοὺς πόδας*, iv. 35, 37 (?), v. 2; Mt. xv. 30 only. Everywhere else *πρός*.

vii. 58, *καλούμενος*, with name, i. 12, 23, iii. 11, viii. 10, ix. 11, x. 1, xiii. 1, xv. 22, 37, xxvii. 8, 14, 16; Luke 9 times, Rev. 4 times.

vii. 60, *θεὶς τὰ γόνατα*, ix. 40, xx. 36, xxi. 5; Luke xxii. 41, cf. v. 8, Mk. xv. 19.

It is impossible, we think, to examine this analysis, in which we might fairly have included other points which we have passed over, without feeling the certain conviction that the speech of Stephen was composed by the author of the rest of the Acts of the Apostles. It may not be out of place to quote some remarks of Lekebusch at the close of an examination of the language of the Acts in general, undertaken for the purpose of ascertaining the literary characteristics of the book, which, although originally having no direct reference to this episode in particular, may well serve to illustrate our own results:—"An unprejudiced critic must have acquired the conviction from the foregoing linguistic examination that, throughout the whole of the Acts of the Apostles, and partly also the

[1] D^{xx} E, H, and other codices read *ἀνεωγμένους*.

Gospel, the same style of language and expression generally prevails, and therefore that our book is an original work, independent of written sources on the whole, and proceeding from a single pen. For when the same expressions are everywhere found, when a long row of words which only recur in the Gospel and Acts, or comparatively only very seldom in other works of the New Testament, appear equally in all parts, when certain forms of words, peculiarities of word-order, construction and phraseology, indeed even whole sentences, recur in the different sections, a compilation out of documents by different earlier writers can no longer be thought of, and it is 'beyond doubt, that we have to consider our writing as the work of a single author, who has impressed upon it the stamp of a distinct literary style' (Zeller, Theol. Jahrb. 1851, p. 107). The use of written sources is certainly not directly excluded by this, and probably the linguistic peculiarities, of which some of course exist in isolated sections of our work, may be referred to this. But as these peculiarities consist chiefly of ἅπαξ λεγομένα, which may rather be ascribed to the richness of the author's vocabulary than to his talent for compilation, and generally in comparison with the great majority of points of agreement almost disappear, we must from the first be prepossessed against the theory that our author made use of written sources, and only allow ourselves to be moved to such a conclusion by further distinct phenomena in the various parts of our book, especially as the prologue of the Gospel, so often quoted for the purpose, does not at all support it. But in any case, as has already been remarked, *the* opinion that, in the Acts of the Apostles, the several parts are strung together almost without

alteration, is quite irreconcilable with the result of our linguistic examination. Zeller rightly says:—'Were the author so dependent a compiler, the traces of such a proceeding must necessarily become apparent in a thorough dissimilarity of language and expression.' And this dissimilarity would be all the greater if his sources, as in that case we could scarcely help admitting, belonged to widely separated spheres as regards language and mode of thought. On the other hand, it would be altogether inexplicable that, in all parts of the work, the same favourite expressions, the same turns, the same peculiarities of vocabulary and syntax should meet us. This phenomenon only becomes conceivable when we suppose that the contents of our work were brought into their present form by one and the same person, and that the work as it lies before us was not merely *compiled* by some one, but was also *composed* by him.'[1]

Should an attempt be made to argue that, even if it be conceded that the language is that of the Author of Acts, the sentiments may be those actually expressed by Stephen, it would at once be obvious that such an explanation is not only purely arbitrary and incapable of proof, but opposed to the facts of the case. It is not the language only which can be traced to the Author of the rest of the Acts but, as we have shown, the whole plan of the speech is the same as that of others in different parts of the work. Stephen speaks exactly as Peter does before him, and Paul at a later period. There is just that amount of variety which a writer of not unlimited resources can introduce to express the views of dif-

[1] Lekebusch, Die Comp. und Entsteh, der Apostelgesch., p. 79 f.

ferent men under different circumstances, but there is so much which is nevertheless common to them all, that community of authorship cannot be denied. On the other hand, the improbabilities of the narrative, the singular fact that Stephen is not mentioned by the Apostle Paul, and the peculiarities which may be detected in the speech itself receive their very simple explanation when linguistic analysis so clearly demonstrates that, whatever small nucleus of fact may lie at the basis of the episode, the speech actually ascribed to the martyr Stephen is nothing more than a later composition put into his mouth by the Author of the Acts.

CHAPTER VI.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED. PHILIP AND THE EUNUCH. PETER AND CORNELIUS.

We have been forced to enter at such length into the discussion of the speech and martyrdom of Stephen, that we cannot afford space to do more than merely glance at the proceedings of his colleague Philip, as we pass on to more important points in the work before us. The author states that a great persecution broke out at the time of Stephen's death, and that all (πάντες) the community of Jerusalem were scattered abroad "except the Apostles" (πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων). That the heads of the Church, who were well known, should remain unmolested in Jerusalem, whilst the whole of the less known members of the community were persecuted and driven to flight, is certainly an extraordinary and suspicious statement.[1] Even apologists are obliged to admit that the account of the dispersion of the whole church is hyperbolic;[2] but exaggeration and myth enter so largely and persistently into the composition of the Acts of the Apostles, that it is difficult, after any attentive scrutiny, seriously to treat the work as in any strict sense historical at all. It has been

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 46; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 246; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 359; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 182 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 153 f. Cf. *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 98 f.

[2] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 84; *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 161; *Hackett*, Acts, p. 119; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 197.

conjectured by some critics, as well in explanation of this statement as in connection with theories regarding the views of Stephen, that the persecution in question was limited to the Hellenistic community to which Stephen belonged, whilst the Apostles and others, who were known as faithful observers of the law and of the temple worship,[1] were not regarded as heretics by the orthodox Jews.[2] The narrative in the Acts does not seem to support the view that the persecution was limited to the Hellenists;[3] but beyond the fact vouched for by Paul that about this time there was a persecution, we have no data whatever regarding that event. Philip, it is said, went down to the city of Samaria, and "was preaching the Christ"[4] to them. As the statement that "the multitudes with one accord gave heed to the things spoken" to them by Philip is ascribed to the miracles which he performed there, we are unable to regard the narrative as historical, and still less so when we consider the supernatural agency by which his further proceedings are directed and aided. We need only remark that the Samaritans, although only partly of Jewish origin, and rejecting the Jewish Scriptures with the exception of the Pentateuch, worshipped the same God as the Jews, were circumcised, and were equally prepared as a nation to accept the Messiah. The statement that the Apostles Peter and John went to Samaria, in order, by the imposition of hands, to bestow the gift of the Holy Spirit to the

[1] iii. 1, 11, iv. 1, v. 25.

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 46; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 246; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 183; *Tjeenk-Willink*, Just. Mart., p. 25 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 154.

[3] *Baumgarten*, Acts i. p. 160 f.; *Hackett*, Acts, p. 119; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. 71; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 355 f., anm.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 197; *Stier*, Reden d. Ap., i. p. 184 f.

[4] viii. 5 . . . ἐκήρυσσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Χριστόν.

converts baptized by Philip, does not add to the general credibility of the history.[1] As Bleek[2] has well remarked, nothing is known or said as to whether the conversion of the Samaritans effected any change in their relations towards the Jewish people and the temple in Jerusalem; and the mission of Philip to the Samaritans, as related in the Acts, cannot in any case be considered as having any important bearing on the question before us. We shall not discuss the episode of Simon at all, although, in the opinion of eminent critics, it contains much that is suggestive of the true character of the Acts of the Apostles. An "Angel of the Lord" (ἄγγελος κυρίου) speaks to Philip, and desires him to go to the desert way from Jerusalem to Gaza,[3] where the Spirit tells him[4] to draw near and join himself to the chariot of a man of Ethiopia who had come to worship at Jerusalem, and was then returning home. Philip runs thither, and hearing him read Isaiah, expounds the passage to him, and at his own request the eunuch is at once baptized. "And when they came up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away (πνεῦμα κυρίου ἥρπασεν) Philip, and the eunuch saw him no more; for he went on his way rejoicing; but Philip was found at Azotus."[5] Attempts have of course been made to explain naturally the supernatural features of this narrative.[6] Ewald, who is master of the art of rationalistic explanation, says, with regard to the order given by the angel: "he felt impelled as by the power and the clear voice of an angel" to go in that

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 47; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 246; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette Apg., p. 123; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 156 f.

[2] Hebräerbr., i. p. 57, anm. 72. [3] viii. 26.

[4] v. 29. [5] v. 39 f. Azotus was upwards of 30 miles off.

[6] *Ewald*, Gesch. des V. Isr., vi. p. 219 f.; *Olshausen*, Apostelgesch., p. 138. *Meyer* has abandoned his earlier views of this kind.

direction; and the final miracle is disposed of by a contrast of the disinterestedness of Philip with the conduct of Gehazi, the servant of Elisha: it was the desire to avoid reward, "which led him all the more hurriedly to leave his new convert;" "and it was as though the Spirit of the Lord himself snatched him from him another way," &c., &c. "From Gaza Philip repaired rapidly northward to Ashdod, &c."[1] The great mass of critics reject such evasions, and recognise that the Author relates miraculous occurrences. The introduction of supernatural agency in this way, however, removes the story from the region of history. Such statements are antecedently, and, indeed, coming from an unknown writer and without corroboration, are absolutely incredible, and no means exist of ascertaining what original tradition may have assumed this mythical character. Zeller supposes that only the personality and nationality of the Eunuch are really historical,[2] All that need here be added is, that the great majority of critics agree that the Ethiopian was probably at least a Proselyte of the Gate,[3] as his going to Jerusalem to worship seems clearly to indicate.[4] In any

[1] Gesch. V. Isr., vi. 219, 220.

[2] Die Apostelgesch., p. 176. Cf. *Holtzmann*, Bunsen's Bibelwerk, viii. 339.

[3] *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 183; *von Döllinger*, Chr. u. Kirche, p. 48; *Ebrard*, zu Olsh. Apg., p. 135; *Hackett*, Acts, p. 126; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. 76; *Lange*, Das ap. Z., ii. p. 109; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap Z., p. 336; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 354; *de Pressensé*, Hist., i. p. 402; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 158; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. K., p. 126; *Schliemann*, Clementinen, p. 383; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 527; *Thiersch*, Die K. im ap. Z., p. 91; *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., Acts, p. 80. Cf. *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 93; *Stier*, Red. d. Ap., i. 201; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 127 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 176, anm. 1. Lange and some others are inclined to think that he was even a Proselyte of Righteousness.

[4] Some critics doubt whether the term εὐνοῦχος does not indicate merely an official position. *Zeller*, Apg., p. 176, anm. 1; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 367 note. *Humphrey* maintains that it does so here, Acts, p. 76.

case, the mythical elements of this story, as well as the insufficiency of the details, deprive the narrative of historical value.[1]

The episodes of Stephen's speech and martyrdom and the mission of Philip are, in one respect especially, unimportant for the inquiry on which we are now more immediately engaged. They are almost completely isolated from the rest of the Acts: that is to say, no reference whatever is subsequently made to them as forming any precedent for the guidance of the church in the burning question which soon arose within it. Peter, as we shall see, when called upon to visit and baptize Cornelius, exhibits no recollection of his own mission to the Samaritans, and no knowledge of the conversion of the Ethiopian. Moreover, as Stephen plays so small a part in the history, and Philip does not reappear upon the scene after this short episode, no opportunity is afforded of comparing one part of their history with the rest. In passing on to the account of the baptism of Cornelius, we have at least the advantage of contrasting the action attributed to Peter with his conduct on earlier and later occasions, and a test is thus supplied which is of no small value for ascertaining the truth of the whole representation. To this narrative we must now address ourselves.

As an introduction to the important events at Cæsarea, the Author of the Acts relates the particulars of a visit which Peter pays to Lydda and Joppa, during the course of which he performs two very remarkable miracles. At the former town he finds a certain man named Æneas,

[1] viii. 37 of the authorized version, which is omitted by Codices A, B, C, H, ℵ, and many others, and of course omitted as spurious by most editors, is an example of the way in which dogmas become antedated.

paralysed, who had lain on a bed for eight years. Peter said to him: "Æneas, Jesus the Christ healeth thee; arise and make thy bed." And he arose immediately.[1] As the consequence of this miracle, the writer states that: "All who dwelt at Lydda and the Sharon saw him, who turned to the Lord."[2] The exaggeration of such a statement[3] is too palpable to require argument. The effect produced by the supposed miracle is almost as incredible as the miracle itself, and the account altogether has little claim to the character of sober history.

This mighty work, however, is altogether eclipsed by a miracle which Peter performs about the same time at Joppa. A certain woman, a disciple, named Tabitha, who was "full of good works," fell sick in those days and died, and when they washed her, they laid her in an upper chamber, and sent to Peter at Lydda, beseeching him to come to them without delay. When Peter arrived they took him into the upper chamber, where all the widows stood weeping, and showed coats and garments which Dorcas used to make while she was with them. "But Peter put them all out, and kneeled down and prayed; and, turning to the body, said: Tabitha, arise. And she opened her eyes, and when she saw Peter she sat up. And he gave her his hand, and raised her up, and when he called the saints and the widows, he presented her alive." Apparently, the raising of the dead did not produce as much effect as the cure of the paralytic, for the writer only adds here: "And it was known throughout all Joppa; and many believed in the Lord."[4] We shall hereafter have to speak of the perfect calmness and absence of surprise with which these early writers relate

[1] ix. 33, 34.
[2] ix. 35.
[3] *Zeller*, Apostelgesch., p. 177 f.
[4] ix. 36—42.

the most astonishing miracles. It is evident from the manner in which this story is narrated that the miracle was anticipated.[1] The ὑπερῷον in which the body is laid cannot have been the room generally used for that purpose, but is probably the single upper chamber of such a house which the Author represents as specially adopted in anticipation of Peter's arrival.[2] The widows who stand by weeping and showing the garments made by the deceased complete the preparation. As Peter is sent for after Dorcas had died, it would seem as though the writer intimated that her friends expected him to raise her from the dead. The explanation of this singular phenomenon, however, becomes clear when it is remarked that the account of this great miracle is closely traced from that of the raising of Jairus' daughter in the Synoptics,[3] and more especially in the second Gospel.[4] In that instance Jesus is sent for; and, on coming to the house, he finds people "weeping and wailing greatly." He puts them all forth, like Peter; and, taking the child by the hand, says to her: "'Talitha koum,' which is being interpreted: Maiden, I say unto thee, arise. And immediately the maiden arose and walked."[5] Baur and others[6] conjecture that even the name "Tabitha, which by interpreta-

[1] *Zeller*, Apg., p. 178; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette, Apg., p. 150. Cf. *Davidson*, Int. N. T. ii. p. 249 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 234.

[2] *Meyer*, Apg., p. 234; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 178, anm. 1.

[3] Mt. ix. 18, 19, 23—25; Mk. v. 22, 23, 35—42; Luke viii. 41, 42, 49—56.

[4] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 219, anm. 1; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 249 f., *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 414; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 150; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen d. Schr. d. Lukas, i. p. 48; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 177.

[5] Mk. v. 38—42.

[6] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 219, anm. 1; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen, p. 48. In Mk. v. 41, Ταλιθὰ κούμ, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον· τὸ κοράσιον . . . In Acts ix. 36, Ταβιθά, ἡ διερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς.

tion is called Dorcas," was suggested by the words Ταλιθὰ κούμ, above quoted. The Hebrew original of Ταβιθά signifies "Gazelle," and they contend that it was used, like Ταλιθά, in the sense generally of: Maiden. [1] These two astonishing miracles, reported by an unknown writer, and without any corroboration, are absolutely incredible, and cannot prepossess any reasonable mind with confidence in the narrative to which they form an introduction, and the natural distrust which they awaken is fully confirmed when we find supernatural agency employed at every stage of the following history.

We are told [2] that a certain devout centurion, named Cornelius, "saw in a vision plainly" (εἶδεν ἐν ὁράματι φανερῶς) an angel of God, who said to him: "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God. And now send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, who is surnamed Peter, whose house is by the sea side." After giving these minute directions, the angel departed,

[1] The leading peculiarities of the two accounts may be contrasted thus—

Acts ix. 36 . . . τις ἦν μαθήτρια ὀνόματι Ταβιθά, ἡ διερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς. 38. . . . ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Π. ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῇ (Λύδδ.), ἀπέστειλαν δύο ἄνδρας πρὸς αὐτὸν παρακαλοῦντες· Μὴ ὀκνήσῃς διελθεῖν ἕως ἡμῶν. 39. . . . πᾶσαι αἱ χῆραι κλαίουσαι καὶ . . . 40. ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἔξω πάντας ὁ Π. . . . καὶ ἐπιστρέψας πρὸς τὸ σῶμα εἶπεν· Ταβιθὰ ἀνάστηθι. ἡ δὲ . . . ἀνεκάθισεν. 41. δοὺς δὲ αὐτῇ χεῖρα ἀνέστησεν αὐτήν.

Luke viii. 41. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ . . . παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. 52. ἔκλαιον δὲ πάντες καὶ . . . 54. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας ἔξω*, καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, ἐφώνησεν λέγων· Ἡ παῖς, ἐγείρου. 55. καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα.

Mark v. 40. . . . αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας . . . εἰσπορεύεται . . . 41. καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου λέγει αὐτῇ, Ταλιθὰ κούμ, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον· Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε. 42. καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέστη τὸ κορ. κ. τ. λ.

[2] x. 1 ff.

* Although this is the reading of the Cod. A (and C, except the ἔξω) and others, it is omitted by other ancient MSS.

and Cornelius sent three messengers to Joppa. Just as they approached the end of their journey on the morrow, Peter went up to the housetop to pray about the sixth hour, the usual time of prayer among the Jews.[1] He became very hungry, and while his meal was being prepared he fell into a trance and saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending as it had been a great sheet let down by four corners, in which were all four-footed beasts and creeping things of the earth and birds of the air. "And there came a voice to him: Rise, Peter; kill and eat. But Peter said: Not so Lord; for I never ate anything common or unclean. And the voice came unto him again a second time: What God cleansed call not thou common. This was done thrice; and straightway the vessel was taken up into heaven." While Peter "was doubting in himself" what the vision which he had seen meant, the men sent by Cornelius arrived, and "the Spirit said unto him: Behold men are seeking thee; but arise and get thee down and go with them doubting nothing, for I have sent them." Peter went with them on the morrow, accompanied by some of the brethren, and Cornelius was waiting for them with his kinsmen and near friends whom he had called together for the purpose. "And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell at his feet and worshipped. But Peter took him up, saying: Arise; I myself also am a man."[2] Going in, he finds many persons assembled, to whom he said: "Ye know how it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company with, or come unto one of another nation; and yet God showed me that I should not call

[1] *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. pp. 152, 222; *Lange*, Das ap. Zeit., ii. 131; *Lightfoot*, Works, viii. 215 f.

[2] x. 26; cf. xiv. 14, 15.

any man common or unclean. Therefore also I came without gainsaying when sent for. I ask, therefore, for what reason ye sent for me?" Cornelius narrates the particulars of his vision and continues: "Now, therefore, we are all present before God to hear all the things that have been commanded thee of the Lord. Then Peter opened his mouth and said: Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to him," and so on. While Peter is speaking, "the Holy Spirit fell on all those who heard the word. And they of the circumcision who believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also has been poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit; for they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God. Then answered Peter: Can any one forbid the water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Spirit as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."

We shall not waste time discussing the endeavours of Kuinoel, Neander, Lange, Ewald, and others, to explain away as much as possible the supernatural elements of this narrative, for their attempts are repudiated by most apologists, and the miraculous phenomena are too clearly described and too closely connected with the course of the story to be either ignored or eliminated. Can such a narrative, heralded by such miracles as the instantaneous cure of the paralytic Æneas, and the raising from the dead the maiden Dorcas be regarded as sober history? Of course many maintain that it can, and comparatively few have declared themselves against this.[1] We have, however, merely the

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 90 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 219 f.; *Gfrörer*,

narrative of an unknown author to set against unvarying experience, and that cannot much avail. We must now endeavour to discover how far this episode is consistent with the rest of the facts narrated in this book itself, and with such trustworthy evidence as we can elsewhere bring to bear upon it. We have already in an earlier part of our inquiry pointed out that in the process of exhibiting a general parallelism between the Apostles Peter and Paul, a very close *pendant* to this narrative has been introduced by the author into the history of Paul. In the story of the conversion of Paul, the Apostle has his vision on the way to Damascus,[1] and about the same time the Lord in a vision desires Ananias ("a devout man, according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews that dwell" in Damascus),[2] "arise, and go to the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one named Saul of Tarsus; for behold he prayeth, and saw in a vision a man named Ananias coming in and putting his hand on him that he might receive sight." On this occasion also the gift of the Holy Spirit is conferred and Saul is baptized.[3] Whilst such miraculous agency is so rare elsewhere, it is so common in the Acts of the Apostles that the employment of visions and of angels, under every circumstance, is one of the characteristics of the author, and may therefore be set down to his own imagination.

No one who examines this episode attentively, we

Die heil. Sage, i. p. 414 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 340; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 151 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 52, note 1; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 179 ff.

[1] ix. 3 ff.

[2] xxii. 12, Ἀνανίας δε τις, ἀνὴρ εὐλαβὴς (E and others, εὐσεβὴς) κατὰ τὸν νόμον, μαρτυρούμενος ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν κατοικούντων Ἰουδαίων. Cf. x. 1 f., Ἀνὴρ δέ τις . . . Κορνήλιος . . . εὐσεβὴς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν . . . 22 . . . μαρτυρούμενός τε ὑπὸ ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων. [3] ix. 10—18.

think, can doubt that the narrative before us is composed in apologetic interest,[1] and is designed to have a special bearing upon the problem as to the relation of the Pauline Gospel to the preaching of the Twelve. Baur[2] has acutely pointed out the significance of the very place assigned to it in the general history, and its insertion immediately after the conversion of Paul, and before the commencement of his ministry, as a legitimation of his apostleship of the Gentiles. One point stands clearly out of the strange medley of Jewish prejudice, Christian liberalism, and supernatural interference which constitute the elements of the story: the actual conviction of Peter regarding the relation of the Jew to the Gentile, that the Gospel is addressed to the former and that the Gentile is excluded,[3] which has to be removed by a direct supernatural revelation from heaven. The author recognises that this was the general view of the primitive church, and this is the only particular in which we can perceive historical truth in the narrative. The complicated machinery of visions and angelic messengers is used to justify the abandonment of Jewish restrictions, which was preached by Paul amidst so much virulent opposition. Peter anticipates and justifies Paul in his ministry of the uncircumcision, and the overthrow of Mosaic barriers has the sanction and seal of a divine command. We have to see whether the history itself

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 90 ff., 96 f., 143 anm. 1; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 151: *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 205; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 189 f., 332.

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 90; *Schneckenburger*, Zweck d. Apostelgesch., p. 170 ff.

[3] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 91 ff.; *Ebrard*, zu Olsh. Apg., p. 159 ff.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 223 f.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z. p. 339; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 290; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 158 ff.; *de Pressensé*, Hist. i. p. 408 f.; *Thiersch*, Die K. im ap. Z., p. 92 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 179 ff.

does not betray its mythical character, not only in its supernatural elements, but in its inconsistency with other known or narrated incidents in the apostolical narrative.

There has been much difference of opinion as to whether the centurion Cornelius had joined himself in any recognised degree to the Jewish religion before this incident, and a majority of critics maintain that he is represented as a Proselyte of the Gate.[1] The terms in which he is described, x. 2, as εὐσεβὴς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν, certainly seem to indicate this, and probably the point would not have been questioned but for the fact that the writer evidently intends to deal with the subject of Gentile conversion, with which the representation that Cornelius was already a proselyte would somewhat clash.[2] Whether a proselyte or not, the Roman centurion is said to be "devout and fearing God with all his house, giving much alms to the people, and praying to God always;"[3] and probably the ambiguity as to whether he had actually become affiliated in any way to Mosaism is intentional. When Peter, however, with his scruples removed by the supernatural communication with which he had just been favoured, indicates their previous strength by the statement: "Ye know how it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company with or come unto

[1] *Bleek*, Einl., p. 370; *Credner*, Das N. T., ii. p. 28; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 250; *von Döllinger*, Christ. u. Kirche, p. 49: *Ebrard*, zu Olsh. Apg., p. 161; *Jowett*, The Eps. of St. Paul, ii. p. 19; *Kuinoel*, Comm. N. T., iv. p. 358; *Lange*, Das ap. Z., ii. p. 131 f.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Zeit., p. 338 f.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 215 f.; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 382 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 92; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 161; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 407 f.; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. K., pp. 126, 139; *Stier*, Red. d. Apost., i. p. 204; *Thiersch*, K. im ap. Z., p. 91; *Weiseler*, Chron. d. ap. Z., p. 145. Cf. *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 110; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 190.

[2] *Zeller*, Apg., p. 190; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette, Apg., p. 153; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 238 f. Cf. *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 290 f. [3] x. 2, cf. 22.

one of another nation,"[1] the author evidently oversteps the mark, and betrays the unhistorical nature of the narrative; for such an affirmation not only could not have been made by Peter, but could only have been advanced by a writer who was himself a Gentile, and writing at a distance from the events described. There is no injunction of the Mosaic law declaring such intercourse unlawful,[2] nor indeed is such a rule elsewhere heard of, and even apologists who refer to the point have no show of authority by which to support such a statement.[3] Not only was there no legal prohibition, but it is impossible to conceive that there was any such exclusiveness practised by traditional injunction.[4] As de Wette appropriately remarks, moreover, even if such a prohibition existed as regards idolaters, it would still be inconceivable how it could apply to Cornelius: "a righteous man and fearing God, and of good report among all the nation of the Jews."[5] It is also inconsistent with the zeal for proselytism displayed by the Pharisees,[6] the strictest sect of the Jews; and the account given by Josephus of the

[1] x. 28.

[2] *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 242; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette Apg., p. 159; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 158; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 187.

[3] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 116; *Beelen*, Act. Apost., p. 284 f.; *Ebrard*, zu Olsh. Apg., p. 168; *Grotius*, Annot. in N. T., v. p. 83; *Hackett*, Acts, p. 150 f.; *Kuinoel*, Comm. N. T., iv. p. 377 f.; *Lightfoot*, Works, viii. p. 217 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 247 f.; *Oertel*, Paulus, p. 210 f.; *Schoettgen*, Horæ Hebr., p. 448. The passages in *Juvenal*, Sat., xiv. 103, and *Tacitus*, Hist., v. 5, sometimes quoted, have no real bearing on the subject. The habits of Jews living amongst strange and idolatrous nations, by whom they were too often oppressed and persecuted, have nothing to do with such an episode as the present.

[4] *De Wette* quotes against it Schemoth Rabba, sect. 19 f., 118. 3. ad Exod. xii. 2: "Hoc idem est, quod scriptum dicit Jes. lvi. 3: Et non dicet filius advenæ, qui adhæsit Domino, dicendo: separando separavit me Dominus a populo suo." Apostelgesch., p. 158.

[5] x. 22; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 158.

conversion of Izates of Adiabene is totally against it.[1] There is a slight trait which, added to others, tends to complete the demonstration of the unhistorical character of this representation. Peter is said to have lived many days in Joppa with one Simon, a tanner, and it is in his house that the messengers of Cornelius find him.[2] Now the tanner's trade was considered impure amongst the Jews,[3] and it was almost pollution to live in Simon's house. It is argued by some commentators that the fact that Peter lodged there is mentioned to show that he had already emancipated himself from Jewish prejudices.[4] However this may be, it is strangely inconsistent that a Jew who has no objection to live with a tanner should, at the same time, consider it unlawful to hold intercourse of any kind with a pious Gentile, who, if not actually a Proselyte of the Gate, had every qualification for becoming one. This indifference to the unclean and polluting trade of the tanner, moreover, is inconsistent with the reply which Peter gives to the voice which bids him slay and eat:—"Not so, Lord, for I never ate anything common or unclean." No doubt the intercourse to which Peter refers indicates, or at least includes, eating and drinking with one of another country, and this alone could present any intelligible difficulty, for the mere transaction of business or conversation with strangers must have been daily necessary to the Jews. It must be remarked, however, that, when Peter makes the statement which we are discussing, nothing whatever is said of eating with the Centurion or sitting with him

[1] Antiq. xx. 2, 3.

[2] ix. 43, x. 6.

[3] *Schoettgen*, Horæ Hebr., p. 447; *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 109; *Hackett*, Acts, p. 144; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 235; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 199; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 150; *Wordsworth*, Greek Test., Acts, p. 88.

[4] *De Wette*, Apg., p. 150; *Overbeck*, Ib., p. 150.

at table. This leads to a striking train of reflection upon the whole episode. It is a curious thing that the supernatural vision, which is designed to inform Peter and the Apostles that the Gentiles might be received into the Church, should take the form of a mere declaration that the distinction of clean and unclean animals was no longer binding, and that he might indifferently kill and eat. One might have thought that, on the supposition that Heaven desired to give Peter and the Church a command to admit the Gentiles unconditionally to the benefits of the Gospel, this would be simply and clearly stated. This was not done at all, and the intimation by which Peter supposes himself justified in considering it lawful to go to Cornelius is, in the first place, merely on the subject of animals defined as clean and unclean. Doubtless the prohibition as to certain meats might tend to continue the separation between Jew and Gentile, and the disregard of such distinctions of course promoted general intercourse with strangers; but this by no means explains why the abrogation of this distinction is made the intimation to receive Gentiles into the Church. When Peter returns to Jerusalem we are told that "they of the circumcision"—that is to say, the whole Church there, since at that period all were "of the circumcision," and this phrase further indicates that the writer has no historical stand-point—contended with him. The subject of the contention we might suppose was the baptism of Gentiles; but not so: the charge brought against him was:—"Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them."[1] The subject of Paul's dispute with Peter at Antioch simply was that, "before that certain came from James, he did eat with

[1] xi. 3.

the Gentiles; but when they came he withdrew, fearing them of the circumcision."[1] That the whole of these passages should turn merely on the fact of eating with men who were uncircumcised, is very suggestive, and as the Church at Jerusalem make no allusion to the baptism of uncircumcised Gentiles, it would lead to the inference that nothing was known of such an event, and that the circumstance was simply added to some other narrative; and this is rendered all the more probable by the fact that, in the affair at Antioch as well as throughout the Epistle to the Galatians, Peter is very far from acting as one who had been the first to receive uncircumcised Gentiles freely into the Church.

It is usually admitted that the vision of Peter abrogated the distinction of clean and unclean animals so long existing in the Mosaic law,[2] but there is no evidence that any subsequent gradual abandonment of the rule was ascribed to such a command; and it is remarkable that Peter himself not only does not, as we shall presently see, refer to this vision as authority for disregarding the distinction of clean and unclean meats, and for otherwise considering nothing common or unclean, but acts as if such a vision had never taken place. The famous decree of the Council of Jerusalem, moreover, makes no allusion to any modification of the Mosaic law in the case of Jewish Christians, whatever relaxation it may seem to grant to Gentile converts, and there is no external evidence of any kind whatever that so important an

[1] Gal. ii. 12.

[2] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 113 f.; *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 240 ff.; *von Döllinger*, Chr. u. K., p. 50; *Ebrard*, zu Olsh. Apg., p. 165 f.; *Hackett*, Acts, p. 147; *Lange*, Das ap. Z., ii. p. 133; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 244 f.; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 381 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 157; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 408 f.; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 156.

abolition of ancient legal prescriptions was thus introduced into Christendom.

We have, however, fortunately one test of the historical value of this whole episode, to which we have already briefly referred, but which we must now more closely apply. Paul himself, in his Epistle to the Galatians, narrates the particulars of a scene between himself and Peter at Antioch, of which no mention is made in the Acts of the Apostles, and we think that no one can fairly consider that episode without being convinced that it is utterly irreconcilable with the supposition that the vision which we are now examining can ever have appeared to Peter, or that he can have played the part attributed to him in the conversion and baptism of uncircumcised Gentiles. Paul writes: "But when Cephas came to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was condemned. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles, but when they came he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them of the circumcision, and the other Jews also joined in his hypocrisy."[1] It will be remembered that, "they of the circumcision" in Jerusalem, at the head of whom was James, from whom came those "of the circumcision" of whom Peter was afraid at Antioch, contended with Peter for going in "to men uncircumcised and eating with them,"[2] the very thing which was in question at Antioch. In the Acts, Peter is represented as defending his conduct by relating the divine vision under the guidance of which he acted, and the author states as the result that, "When they heard these things they held their peace and glorified God, saying: Then to the Gentiles also God gave repentance

[1] Gal. ii. 11—13. [2] Acts xi. 2, 3.

unto life."[1] This is the representation of the Author of the vision and of the conversion of Cornelius, but very different is his conduct as described by the Apostle Paul, very dissimilar the phenomena presented by a narrative upon which we can rely. The "certain who came from James" can never have heard of the direct communication from Heaven which justified Peter's conduct, and can never have glorified God in the manner described, or Peter could not have had any reason to fear them; for a mere reference to his vision, and to the sanction of the Church of Jerusalem, must have been sufficient to reconcile them to his freedom. Then, is it conceivable that after such a vision, and after being taught by God himself not to call any man or thing common or unclean, Peter could have acted as he did for fear of them of the circumcision? His conduct is convincing evidence that he knew as little of any such vision as those who came from James. On the other hand, if we require further proof it is furnished by the Apostle Paul himself. Is it conceivable, we again ask, that if such an episode had ever really occurred the Apostle Paul would not have referred to it upon this occasion? What more appropriate argument could he have used, what more legitimate rebuke could he have administered, than merely to have reminded Peter of his own vision? He both rebukes him and argues, but his rebuke and his argument have quite a different complexion; and we confidently affirm that no one can read that portion of the Epistle to the Galatians without feeling certain that, had the writer been aware of such a divine communication—and we think it must be conceded without question that, if it had taken place, he

[1] Acts xi. 18.

must have been aware of it[1]—he would have referred to so direct and important an authority. Neither here nor in the numerous places where such an argument would have been so useful to the Apostle does Paul betray the slightest knowledge of the episode of Cornelius. The historic occurrence at Antioch, so completely ignored by the Author of the Acts, totally excludes the mythical story of Cornelius.[2]

There are merely one or two other points in connection with the episode to which we must call attention. In his address to Cornelius, Peter says, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons" (*οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήμπτης ὁ θεός*). Now this is not only a thoroughly Pauline sentiment, but Paul has more than once made use of precisely the same expression. Rom. ii. 11. "For there is no respect of persons with God" (*οὐ γάρ ἐστιν προσωπολημψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*), and, again, Gal. ii. 6, "God respecteth no man's person," (*πρόσωπον ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει*).[3] The Author of the Acts was certainly acquainted with the epistles of Paul, and the very manner in which he represents Peter as employing this expression betrays the application of a sentiment previously in his mind, "Of a truth I perceive," &c. The circumstance confirms what Paul had already said.[4] Then, in the defence of his conduct at Jerusalem, Peter is represented as saying: "And I remembered the word of the Lord,

[1] Indeed the reference to this case, supposed to be made by Peter himself, in Paul's presence, excludes the idea of ignorance, if the Acts be treated as historical.

[2] *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 415; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 151; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 119 f., 127 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 185 ff.

[3] Cf. Ephes. vi. 9, Col. iii. 25.

[4] Compare further x. 35 ff. with Rom. ii. iii., &c. The sentiments and even the words are Pauline.

how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit."[1] Now these words are by all the Gospels put into the mouth of John the Baptist, and not of Jesus,[2] but the Author of the Acts seems to put them into the mouth of Jesus at the beginning of the work,[3] and their repetition here is only an additional proof of the fact that the episode of Cornelius, as it stands before us, is not historical, but is merely his own composition.

The whole of this narrative, with its complicated series of miracles, is evidently composed to legitimate the free reception into the Christian Church of Gentile converts and, to emphasise the importance of the divine ratification of their admission, Peter is made to repeat to the Church of Jerusalem the main incidents which had just been fully narrated. On the one hand, the previous Jewish exclusiveness both of Peter and of the Church is displayed, first, in the resistance of the apostle, which can only be overcome by the vision and the direct order of the Holy Spirit, and by the manifest outpouring of the Spirit upon the Centurion and his household; and second, in the contention of them of the circumcision, which is only overcome by an account of the repeated signs of divine purpose and approval. The universality of the Gospel could not be more broadly proclaimed than in the address of Peter to Cornelius. Not the Jews alone, "but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to him." Pauline principles are thus anticipated and, as we have pointed out, are expressed almost in the words of the Apostle of the Gentiles.[4] The Jews who go with

[1] xi. 16.
[2] Mt. iii. 11, Mk. i. 8, Luke iii. 16, John i. 26, 33.
[3] i. 5.
[4] *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 184 f.

Peter were astonished because that on the Gentiles also had been poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit,[1] and the Church of Jerusalem, on hearing of these things, glorified God that repentance unto life had been given to the Gentiles. It is impossible that the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of the Church could be more prominently signified than by this episode, introduced by prodigious miracles and effected by supernatural machinery. Where, however, are the consequences of this marvellous recognition of the Gentiles? It does not in the slightest degree preclude the necessity for the Council, which we shall presently consider; it does not apparently exercise any influence on James and the Church of Jerusalem; Peter, indeed, refers vaguely to it, but as a matter out of date and almost forgotten; Paul, in all his disputes with the emissaries of the Church of Jerusalem, in all his pleas for the freedom of his Gentile converts, never makes the slightest allusion to it; it remains elsewhere unknown and, so far as any evidence goes, utterly without influence upon the primitive church.[2] This will presently become more apparent; but already it is clear enough to those who will exercise calm reason that it is impossible to consider this narrative with its tissue of fruitless miracles as a historical account of the development of the Church.

[1] x. 45 f.

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 91 ff.; *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 183 ff.

CHAPTER VII

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE WORK, CONTINUED.

PAUL THE APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES.

We have now arrived at the point in our examination of the Acts in which we have the inestimable advantage of being able to compare the narrative of the unknown Author with the distinct statements of the Apostle Paul. In doing so, we must remember that the Author must have been acquainted with the Epistles which are now before us, and supposing it to be his purpose to present a certain view of the transactions in question, whether for apologetic or conciliatory reasons or any other cause, it is obvious that it would not be reasonable to expect divergencies of so palpable a nature that any reader of the letters must at once too clearly perceive such contradictions. When the Acts were written, it is true, the Author could not have known that the Epistles of Paul were to attain the high canonical position which they now occupy, and might, therefore, use his materials more freely; still a certain superficial consistency it would be natural to expect. Unfortunately, our means of testing the statements of the Author are not so minute as is desirable, although they are often of much value, and seeing the great facility with which, by apparently slight alterations and omissions, a different complexion can be given to circumstances regarding which no very

full details exist elsewhere, we must be prepared to seize every indication which may enable us to form a just estimate of the nature of the writing which we are examining.

In the first two chapters of his Epistle to the Galatians, the Apostle Paul relates particulars regarding some important epochs of his life, which likewise enter into the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles. The Apostle gives an account of his own proceedings immediately after his conversion, and of the visit which about that time he paid to Jerusalem; and, further, of a second visit to Jerusalem fourteen years later, and to these we must now direct our attention. We defer consideration of the narrative of the actual conversion of Paul for the present, and merely intend here to discuss the movements and conduct of the Apostle immediately subsequent to that event. The Acts of the Apostles represent Paul as making five journeys to Jerusalem subsequent to his joining the Christian body. The first, ix. 26 ff, takes place immediately after his conversion; the second, xi. 30, xii. 25, is upon an occasion when the Church at Antioch are represented as sending relief to the brethren of Judæa by the hands of Barnabas and Saul, during a time of famine; the third visit to Jerusalem, xv. 1 ff, Paul likewise pays in company with Barnabas, both being sent by the Church of Antioch to confer with the Apostles and Elders as to the necessity of circumcision, and the obligation to observe the Mosaic law in the case of Gentile converts; the fourth, xviii. 21 ff, when he goes to Ephesus with Priscilla and Aquila, "having shaved his head in Cenchrea, for he had a vow;" and the fifth and last, xxi. 15 ff., when the disturbance took place in the temple which led to his arrest and journey to Rome.

The circumstances and general character of these visits to Jerusalem, and more especially of that on which the momentous conference is described as having taken place, are stated with so much precision, and they present features of such marked difference, that it might have been supposed there could not have been any difficulty in identifying, with certainty, at least the visits to which the Apostle refers in his letter, more especially as upon both occasions he mentions important particulars which characterised those visits. It is a remarkable fact, however, that, such are the divergences between the statements of the unknown Author and of the Apostle, upon no point has there been more discussion amongst critics and divines from the very earliest times, or more decided difference of opinion. Upon general grounds, it has been seen, there has been good reason to doubt the historical character of the Acts. Is it not a singularly suggestive circumstance that, when it is possible to compare the authentic representations of Paul with the narrative of the Acts, even apologists perceive so much opening for doubt and controversy?

The visit described in the ninth chapter of the Acts is generally [1] identified with that which is mentioned in the first chapter of the Epistle. This unanimity, however, arises mainly from the circumstance that both writers clearly represent that visit as the first which Paul paid to Jerusalem after his conversion, for the details of the two narratives are anything but in agreement with each other. Although, therefore, critics are forced to agree as to the bare identity of the visit, this harmony is immediately disturbed on examining the two accounts, and whilst the one party find the statements in the Acts

[1] There have, however, been differences of opinion also regarding this.

reconcileable with those of Paul, a large body more or less distinctly declare them to be contradictory, and unhistorical.[1] In order that the question at issue may be fairly laid before the reader, we shall give the two accounts in parallel columns.

Acts ix. 19 ff.	Ep. to Gal. i. 15 ff.
19. And he was certain days (ἡμέρας τινάς) with the disciples in Damascus,	15. But when it pleased God . . .
20. And immediately (εὐθέως) was preaching Jesus in the synagogues, &c., &c.	16. To reveal his son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles; immediately (εὐθέως) I conferred not with flesh and blood;
21. And all that heard him were amazed, saying, &c.	
22. But Saul was increasing in strength more and more, and confounding the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is the Christ.	17. Neither went I up to Jerusalem to those who were Apostles before me; but I went away into Arabia, and returned again into Damascus.
23. And after many days (ἡμέραι ἱκαναὶ) were fulfilled, the Jews took counsel to kill him; 24. But their plot was known to Saul. And they were even watching the gates day and night to kill him.	
25. But the disciples took him by night, and let him down through the wall in a basket.	
26. And when he came to Jerusalem he was assaying to join himself to the disciples; but all were	18. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit[2] Cephas, and abode with him fifteen days.

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 121 ff.; *Brandes*, Des Ap. Paul. Sendschr. an die Gal., 1869, p. 77 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 213; *Eichhorn*, Einl., iii. p. 23 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 412 f.; *Hausrath*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., iv. p. 419; *Hilgenfeld*, Galaterbrief, 1852, p. 121 ff.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 32 ff.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 230; Galaterbr. 5te Aufl., p. 39 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 140 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxx. ff., 208 note 1; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 368 f.; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 167; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen, u. s. w., p. 31 f.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 33 ff., 47 f., 98; *Stap*, Origines, p. 159 ff.; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 142 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 201 ff. Cf. *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi., p. 398 f., 401 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iv. p. 308; *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm. iv., 1844, p. 31 f.

[2] To become acquainted with.

Acts ix. 19 ff.

afraid of him, not believing that he is a disciple.

27. But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the Apostles, and declared unto them how he saw the Lord in the way, and that he spake to him; and how he preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus.

28. And he was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem, preaching boldly in the name of the Lord.

29. And he was speaking and disputing against the Grecian Jews; but they took counsel to slay him;

30. But when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus.

Ep. to Gal. i. 15 ff.

19. But other of the apostles saw I not save James the Lord's brother.

20. Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not.

21. Thereafter I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia;

22. But I was unknown by face unto the churches of Judæa which were in Christ; but they were only hearing that he who formerly persecuted us is now preaching the faith which once he was destroying: and they glorified God in me.

Now, it is obvious that the representation in the Acts of what Paul did after his conversion differs very widely from the account which the Apostle himself gives of the matter. In the first place, not a word is said in the former of the journey into Arabia; but, on the contrary, it is excluded, and the statement which replaces it directly contradicts that of Paul. The Apostle says that after his conversion: "Immediately[1] (εὐθέως) I conferred not with flesh and blood," but "went away into Arabia." The Author of the Acts says that he spent "some days" (ἡμέρας τινάς) with the disciples in Damascus, and "immediately" (εὐθέως) began to preach in the synagogues. Paul's feelings are so completely misrepresented that, instead of that desire for retirement and solitude which his

[1] Dr. Ellicott remarks, "*straightway*; the word standing prominently forward, and implying that he not only avoided conference with men, but did so from the *very first*." St. Paul's Ep. to the Gal., 4th ed., p. 16.

words express,[1] he is described as straightway plunging into the vortex of public life in Damascus. The general apologetic explanation is, that the author of the Acts either was not aware of the journey into Arabia, or that, his absence there having been short, he did not consider it necessary to mention it. There are no data for estimating the length of time which Paul spent in Arabia, but the fact that the Apostle mentions it with so much emphasis proves not only that he attached much weight to the episode, but that the duration of his visit could not have been unimportant. In any case, the Author of the Acts, whether ignorantly or not, boldly describes the Apostle as doing precisely what he did not. To any ordinary reader, moreover, his whole account of Paul's preaching at Damascus certainly excludes altogether the idea of such a journey, and the argument that it can be inserted anywhere is purely arbitrary. There are many theories amongst apologists, however, as to the part of the narrative in Acts, in which the Arabian journey can be placed. By some it is assigned to a period before he commenced his active labours, and therefore before ix. 20,[2] from which the words of the author repulse it with singular clearness; others intercalate it with even less reason between ix. 20 and 21;[3] a few discover some indication of it in the μᾶλλον ἐνεδυναμοῦτο of ver. 22,[4] an expression, however, which refuses to be forced into such service; a greater number place it in the ἡμέραι ἱκαναί of ver. 23,[5] making that elastic phrase embrace this as well

[1] *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 90.

[2] *Lightfoot*, Ib., p. 90, n. 1; *Robinson*, Acts, p. 50.

[3] *Beelen*, Act. Apost., p. 260.

[4] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 103.

[5] *Bisping*, Ex. H'buch N. T., vi. 1, 1863, p. 187; *Hackett*, Acts, p. 138; *Heinrichs*, N. T. Gr., Act. Apost., i. p. 230; *Humphrey*, Acts, p. 83 f.;

as other difficulties till it snaps under the strain. It seems evident to an unprejudiced reader that the ἡμέραι ἱκαναί are represented as passed in Damascus.[1] And, lastly, some critics place it after ix. 25, regardless of Paul's statement that from Arabia he returned again to Damascus, which, under the circumstances mentioned in Acts, he was not likely to do, and indeed it is obvious that he is there supposed to have at once gone from Damascus to Jerusalem. These attempts at reconciliation are useless. It is of no avail to find time into which a journey to Arabia and the stay there might be forcibly thrust. There still remains the fact that so far from the Arabian visit being indicated in the Acts, the εὐθέως of ix. 20, compared with the εὐθέως of Gal. i. 16, positively excludes it, and proves that the narrative of the former is not historical.[2]

There is another point in the account in Acts which further demands attention. The impression conveyed by the narrative is that Paul went up to Jerusalem not very long after his conversion. The omission of the visit to Arabia shortens the interval before he did so, by removing causes of delay, and whilst no expressions are used which imply a protracted stay in Damascus, incidents are introduced which indicate that the purpose of the writer was to represent the Apostle as losing no time after his conversion before associating himself with the elder

Lange, Das ap. Z., i. p. 97; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 228; Galaterbr., p. 39; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 122, anm. 1; *Oertel*, Paulus, p. 58, anm. 2. Cf. *Ellicott*, St. Paul's Ep. to the Galatians, 4th ed., p. 18; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 180.

[1] *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. p. 103; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 213; *Stap*, Origines, p. 163; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 203.

[2] We shall not discuss the indication given in 2 Cor. xi. 32 of the cause of his leaving Damascus, although several contradictory statements seem to be contained in it.

Apostles and obtaining their recognition of his ministry; and this view, we shall see, is confirmed by the peculiar account which is given of what took place at Jerusalem. The Apostle distinctly states, i. 18, that three years after his conversion he went up to visit Peter.[1] In the Acts he is represented as spending "some days" (ἡμέρας τινάς) with the disciples, and the only other chronological indication given is that after "many days" (ἡμέραι ἱκαναί) the plot occurred which forced him to leave Damascus. It is argued that ἡμέραι ἱκαναί is an indefinite period, which may, according to the usage of the author[2] indicate a considerable space of time, and certainly rather express a long than a short period.[3] The fact is, however, that the instances cited are evidence, in themselves, against the supposition that the author can have had any intention of expressing a period of three years by the words ἡμέραι ἱκαναί. We suppose that no one has ever suggested that Peter staid three years in the house of Simon the tanner at Joppa (ix. 43); or, that when it is said that Paul remained "many days" at Corinth after the insurrection of Jews, the author intends to speak of some years, when in fact the ἡμέραι ἱκαναί contrasted with the expression (xviii. 11): "he continued there a year and six months," used regarding his stay previous to that disturbance, evidently reduces the "yet many days" subsequently spent there to a very small compass. Again, has any one ever suggested that in the

[1] "The 'straightway' of ver. 16 leads to this conclusion: '*At first* I conferred not with flesh and blood, it was only *after the lapse of three years* that I went to Jerusalem.'" *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 83.

[2] Acts ix. 43, xviii. 18, xvii. 7; *Lightfoot*, Ib., p. 89, note 3.

[3] "The difference between the vague 'many days' of the Acts and the definite 'three years' of the Epistle is such as might be expected from the circumstances of the two writers." *Lightfoot*, Ib., p. 89, note 3.

account of Paul's voyage to Rome, where it is said (xxvii. 7) that, after leaving Myrra "and sailing slowly many days" (ἡμέραι ἱκαναί), they had scarcely got so far as Cnidus, an interval of months, not to say years, is indicated? It is impossible to suppose that, by such an expression, the writer intended to indicate a period of three years.[1] That the narrative of the Acts actually represents Paul as going up to Jerusalem soon after his conversion, and certainly not merely at the end of three years, is obvious from the statement in ver. 26, that when Paul arrived at Jerusalem, and was assaying to join himself to the disciples, all were afraid of him, and would not believe in his conversion. It is impossible to suppose that the author could have stated this, if he had desired to imply that Paul had already been a Christian, and publicly preached with so much success at Damascus, for three years.[2] Indeed, the statements in ix. 26 are irreconcilable with the declaration of the Apostle, whatever view be taken of the previous narrative of the Acts. If it be supposed that the author wishes to describe the visit to Jerusalem as taking place three years after his conversion, then the ignorance of that event amongst the brethren there and their distrust of Paul are utterly inconsistent and incredible; whilst if, on the other hand, he represents the Apostle as going to Jerusalem with but little delay in Damascus, as we contend he does, then there is no escape from the conclusion that the Acts, whilst thus giving a narrative consistent with itself,

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 121 f.; *Brandes*, Sendschr. an d. Gal., p. 77; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 283; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 230; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 142; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 203 ff.

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 122; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 283; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 230; *Oertel*, Paulus, p. 58 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 142; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 66 ff.; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 142.

certainly distinctly contradicts the deliberate assertions of the Apostle. It is absolutely incredible that the conversion of a well-known persecutor of the Church (viii. 3 ff.), effected in a way which is represented as so sudden and supernatural, and accompanied by a supposed vision of the Lord, could for three years have remained unknown to the community of Jerusalem. So striking a triumph for Christianity must have been rapidly made known throughout the Church, and the fact that he who formerly persecuted was now zealously preaching the faith which once he destroyed must long have been declared in Jerusalem, which was in such constant communication with Damascus.

The author of the Acts continues in the same strain, stating that Barnabas, under the circumstances just described, took Paul and brought him to the Apostles (*πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους*), and declared to them the particulars of his vision and conversion, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus.[1] No doubt is left that this is the first intimation the Apostles had received of such extraordinary events. After this, we are told that Paul was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem, preaching boldly in the name of the Lord. Here again the declaration of Paul is explicit, and distinctly contradicts this story both in the letter and the spirit. He makes no mention of Barnabas. He states that he went to Jerusalem specially with the view of making the acquaintance of Peter, with whom he remained fifteen days; but he emphatically says:—"But other of the Apostles saw I not, save (*εἰ μὴ*) James, the Lord's brother;" and then he adds the solemn declaration regarding his account of this visit:—"Now the things

[1] ix. 27.

which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not." It is difficult to avoid the impression that some other version of this story was current which the Apostle desired to correct; and, considering his character and position, probably a narrative such as that before us in the Acts would have been supremely displeasing to him. Instead of being presented "to the Apostles," and going in and out with them at Jerusalem, we have here the emphatic assurance that, in addition to Peter, Paul saw no one except "James, the Lord's brother." There has been much discussion as to the identity of this James, and whether he was an apostle or not, but into this it is unnecessary for us to enter. Most writers agree at least that he is the same James, the head of the Church at Jerusalem, whom we again frequently meet with in the Pauline Epistles and in the Acts, and notably in the account of the Apostolic council. The exact interpretation to be put upon the expression εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον has also been the subject of great controversy, the question being whether James is here really called an apostle or not; whether εἰ μὴ is to be understood as applying solely to the verb, in which case the statement would mean that he saw no other of the Apostles, but only James;[1] or to the whole phrase, which would express that he had seen no other of the Apostles save James.[2] It is admitted by many of those who think that in this case the latter signification must be adopted that gramatically

[1] *Bleek*, Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1059; *Credner*, Das N. T., i. p. 44; *Jowett*, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 219; *Winer*, P. ad Gal. Ep., 1859, p. 52; cf. Gramm. N. T. Sprachid., 1867, iii. § 67 e. Cf. *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 127.

[2] *Ellicott*, Galatians, p. 19; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 84; *Meyer*, Galaterbr., p. 42; *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm., iv. p. 1844, p. 31 f.; *Usteri*, Br. an die Galater., 1833, p. 31; *Wieseler*, Comm. Br. an die Gal., 1859, p. 73.

either interpretation is permissible. Even supposing that rightly or wrongly James is here referred to as an Apostle, the statement of the Acts is, in spirit, quite opposed to that of the Epistle; for when we are told that Paul is brought "to the Apostles" (*πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους*), the linguistic usage of the writer implies that he means much more than merely Peter and James. It seems impossible to reconcile the statement, ix. 27, with the solemn assurance of Paul,[1] and if we accept what the Apostle says as truth, and we cannot doubt it, it must be admitted that the account in the Acts is unhistorical.

We arrive at the very same conclusion on examining the rest of the narrative. In the Acts, Paul is represented as being with the Apostles going in and out, preaching openly in Jerusalem, and disputing with the Grecian Jews.[2] No limit is here put to his visit, and it is difficult to conceive that what is narrated is intended to describe a visit of merely fifteen days. A subsequent statement in the Acts, however, explains and settles the point. Paul is represented as declaring to King Agrippa, xxvi. 19 f.: "Wherefore, King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision, but first unto those in Damascus, and throughout all the region of Judæa, and to the Gentiles, I was declaring that they should repent

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 125 f.; *Bleek*, Einl. p. 364; *Brandes*, Sendschr. an d. Gal., p. 77 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 213; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 413; *Hausrath*, Der Ap. Paulus, p. 141; in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., iv. p. 419; *Hilgenfeld*, Galaterbr., p. 122 f., 124 f.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iv. p. 308; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 44 f.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 283; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 127 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette, Apg., p. 145; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 167 f., 180 f.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. P., v. p. 530; *Scholten*, Het Paulin. Ev., p. 448; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen, u. s. w., p. 31 f.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 165 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 47 f.; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 70; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 205 f. Cf. *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm., 1844, iv. p. 31 f.

[2] ix. 28 f.

and turn to God," &c. However this may be, the statement of Paul does not admit the interpretation of such public ministry. His express purpose in going to Jerusalem was, not to preach, but to make the acquaintance of Peter; and it was a marked characteristic of Paul to avoid preaching in ground already occupied by the other Apostles before him [1] Not only is the account in Acts apparently excluded by such considerations and by the general tenor of the epistle, but it is equally so by the direct words of the Apostle (i. 22):—"I was unknown by face unto the churches of Judæa." It is argued that the term: "churches of Judæa" excludes Jerusalem.[2] It might possibly be asserted with reason that such an expression as "the churches of Jerusalem" might exclude the churches of Judæa, but to say that the Apostle, writing elsewhere to the Galatians of a visit to Jerusalem, and of his conduct at that time, intends, when speaking of the "churches of Judæa," to exclude the principal city, seems to us arbitrary and unwarrantable. The whole object of the Apostle is to show the privacy of his visit and his independence of the elder Apostles. He does not use the expression as a contrast to Jerusalem. Nothing in his account leads one to think of any energetic preaching during the visit, and the necessity of finding some way of excluding Jerusalem from the Apostle's expression is simply thrust upon apologists by the account in Acts. Two passages are referred to as supporting the exclusion of Jerusalem from "the churches of Judæa." In John iii. 22, we read: "After

[1] 2 Cor. x. 14 ff. Cf. Rom. xv. 20.

[2] *Alford*, Greek Test., iii. p. 10; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 85; *Meyer*, Gal., p. 46; *Moeller*, zu de Wette, Br. an d. Gal., p. 21; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 71; *De Wette*, Br. an die Gal., p. 21; *Wieseler*, Br. an die Gal., p. 86 f.; *Winer*, P. ad Gal. Ep., p. 53.

these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judæa." In the preceding chapter he is described as being at Jerusalem. We have already said enough about the geographical notices of the author of the Fourth Gospel.[1] Even those who do not admit that he was not a native of Palestine are agreed that he wrote in another country and for foreigners. "The land of Judæa," was therefore a natural expression superseding the necessity of giving a more minute local indication which would have been of little use. The second instance appealed to, though more doubtfully,[2] is Heb. xiii. 24: "They from Italy salute you." We are at a loss to understand how this is supposed to support the interpretation adopted. It is impossible that if Paul went in and out with the Apostles, preached boldly in Jerusalem, and disputed with the Hellenistic Jews, not to speak of what is added, Acts xxvi. 19 f., he could say that he was unknown by face to the churches of Judæa. There is nothing, we may remark, which limits his preaching to the Grecian Jews. Whilst apologists maintain that the two accounts are reconcilable, many of them frankly admit that the account in Acts requires correction from that in the Epistle;[3] but, on the other hand, a still greater number of critics pronounce the narrative in the Acts contradictory to the statements of Paul.[4]

[1] S. R., ii. 419 f. [2] Compare p. 273, n. 2.

[3] *Bleek*, Einl., p. 364 f.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi., p. 403, anm. 1; Sendschr. d. Ap. Paulus, 1857, p. 68 f.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 92; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 127 ff.

[4] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 126 f.; *Brandes*, Gal., p. 77 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 213 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 419; *Hausrath*, in Schenkel's B. L., iv. p. 419; *Hilgenfeld*, Galaterbr., p. 123 ff.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 44 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 146; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxx. ff., 209, n. 2; *Stap*, Origines, p. 165 f.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 33 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 207 f. Cf. *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 127 ff.

There remains another point upon which a few remarks must be made. In Acts ix. 29 f. the cause of Paul's hurriedly leaving Jerusalem is a plot of the Grecian Jews to kill him. Paul does not in the Epistle refer to any such matter, but, in another part of the Acts, Paul is represented as relating, xxii. 17 f.: "And it came to pass, that, when I returned to Jerusalem and was praying in the temple, I was in a trance and saw him saying unto me: Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem, for they will not receive thy witness concerning me," &c., &c. This account differs, therefore, even from the previous narrative in the same book, yet critics are agreed that the visit during which the Apostle is said to have seen this vision was that which we are discussing.[1] The writer is so little a historian working from substantial facts that he forgets the details of his own previous statements; and in the account of the conversion of Paul, for instance, he thrice repeats the story with emphatic and irreconcilable contradictions. We have already observed his partiality for visions, and such supernatural agency is so ordinary a matter with him that, in the first account of this visit, he altogether omits the vision, although he must have known of it then quite as much as on the second occasion. The Apostle, in his authentic and solemn account of this visit, gives no hint of any vision, and leaves no suggestion even of that public preaching which is described in the earlier, and referred to in the later, narrative in the Acts.[2] If we

[1] *Alford*, Greek Test., iii. p. 9; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 364; *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 719; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1860, p. 112; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 92, n. 2; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 231; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 156; *Paley*, Evidences, and Horæ Paul., ed. Potts, ch. v., No. viii., p. 379; *Schrader*, Der Ap. P., i. p. 56; *Wieseler*, Chron. ap. Zeit., p. 165; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 208.

[2] *Paley* (Horæ Paul. v., No. viii.) actually endeavours to show the

had no other grounds for rejecting the account as unhistorical this miraculous vision, added as an after-thought, would have warranted our doing so.

Passing on now to the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, we find that Paul writes:—"Then, after fourteen years, again I went up to Jerusalem . . ." (ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν πάλιν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα . . .). He states the particulars of what took place upon the occasion of this second visit with a degree of minuteness which ought, one might have supposed, to have left no doubt of its identity, when compared with the same visit historically described elsewhere; but such are the discrepancies between the two accounts that, as we have already mentioned, the controversy upon the point has been long and active.[1] The Acts, it will be remembered, relate a second visit of Paul to Jerusalem, after that which we have discussed, upon which occasion it is stated (xi. 30) that he was sent with Barnabas to convey to the community, during a time of famine, the contributions of the Church of Antioch. The third visit of the Acts is that (xv.) when Paul and Barnabas are said to have been deputed to confer with the Apostles regarding the con-

genuineness of the Ep. to the Galatians by the "undesigned coincidence" of the shortness of Paul's visit as stated by himself and the miraculous order reported Acts xxii. 17 f., "Get thee quickly out of Jerusalem." The fallacy, not to say unfairness, of this partial argument needs no demonstration, and indeed it has been well pointed out by *Dr. Jowett.* The Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 350 f.

[1] There was anything but unanimity on the point among the Fathers. *Irenæus* identified the second Galatian visit with the third of Acts (xv.). It is not certain whether *Tertullian* agreed in this (Adv. M., v. 2, 3) or placed it later (Adv. M., i. 20); *Eusebius* thought it the same as the second of Acts; *Epiphanius* identified it with the fifth of Acts (xxi. 15); *Chrysostom* places it after the third of Acts; and the *Chronicon Paschale* interpolates it between Acts xiii. and xv. It is not now necessary to enter minutely into this.

ditions upon which Gentile converts should be admitted into the Christian brotherhood. The circumstances of this visit, more nearly than any other, correspond with those described by the Apostle himself in the Epistle (ii. 1 ff.), but there are grave difficulties in the way of identifying them. If this visit be identical with that described Acts xv., and if Paul, as he states, paid no intermediate visit to Jerusalem, what becomes of the visit interpolated in Acts xi. 30? The first point which we must endeavour to ascertain is exactly what the Apostle intends to say regarding the second visit which he mentions. The purpose of Paul is to declare his complete independence from those who were Apostles before him, and to maintain that his Gospel was not of man, but directly revealed to him by Jesus Christ. In order to prove his independence, therefore, he categorically states exactly what had been the extent of his intercourse with the elder Apostles. He protests that, after his conversion, he had neither conferred with flesh and blood nor sought those who had been Apostles before him, but, on the contrary, that he had immediately gone away to Arabia. It was not until three years had elapsed that he had gone up to Jerusalem, and then only to make the acquaintance of Peter, with whom he had remained only fifteen days, during which he had not seen other of the Apostles save James, the Lord's brother. Only after the lapse of fourteen years did he again go up to Jerusalem. It is argued[1] that when Paul says, "he went up again," (*πάλιν ἀνέβην*), the word *πάλιν* has not the force of *δεύτερον*, and that, so far from excluding any intermediate journey, it merely signifies a

[1] By *Wieseler*, for instance, Chron. des ap. Zeit., p. 182; Br. Pauli an die Galater., 1859, p. 94 f.

repetition of what had been done before, and might have been used of any subsequent journey. Even if this were so, it is impossible to deny that, read with its context, πάλιν ἀνέβην is used in immediate connection with the former visit which we have just discussed. The sequence is distinctly marked by the ἔπειτα "then," and the adoption of the preposition διά—which may properly be read "after the lapse of,"[1]—instead of μετά, seems clearly to indicate that no other journey to Jerusalem had been made in the interval. This can be maintained linguistically; but the point is still more decidedly settled when the Apostle's intention is considered. It is obvious that his purpose would have been totally defeated had he passed over in silence an intermediate visit. Even if, as is argued, the visit referred to in Acts xi. 30 had been of very brief duration, or if he had not upon that occasion had any intercourse with the Apostles, it is impossible that he could have ignored it under the circumstances, for by so doing he would have left the retort in the power of his enemies that he had, on other occasions than those which he had enumerated, been in Jerusalem and in contact with the Apostles. The mere fact that a visit had been unmentioned would have exposed him to the charge of having suppressed it, and suspicion is always ready to assign unworthy motives. If Paul had paid such a hasty visit as is suggested, he would naturally have mentioned the fact and stated the circumstances, whatever they were. These and other reasons convince the majority of critics that the Apostle here enumerates all the visits which he had paid to Jerusalem since his conversion.[2] The visit referred to in Gal. ii. 1 ff.

[1] *Winer*, Grammatik des N. T. Sprachidioms, 7th Aufl., § 47, i. p. 356.
[2] See references, p. 221, note 1.

must be considered the second occasion on which the Apostle Paul went to Jerusalem.

This being the case, can the visit be identified as the second visit described in Acts xi. 30? The object of that journey to Jerusalem, it is expressly stated, was to carry to the brethren in Jerusalem the contributions of the Church of Antioch during a time of famine; whereas Paul explicitly says that he went up to Jerusalem, on the occasion we are discussing, in consequence of a revelation, to communicate the Gospel which he was preaching among the Gentiles. There is not a word about contributions. On the other hand, chronologically it is impossible that the second visit of the Epistle can be the second of the Acts. There is some difference of opinion as to whether the fourteen years are to be calculated from the date of his conversion,[1] or from the previous journey.[2] The latter seems to be the more reasonable supposition, but in either case it is obvious that the identity is excluded. From various data,—the famine under Claudius, and the time of Herod Agrippa's

[1] *Alford*, Greek Test., iii. p. 11; *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Br. an die Galater., 1845, p. 33; *Baur*, Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 478; K. G., i. p. 49; *Bisping*, H'buch N. T., 1863, vi. 1. p. 191; *Ebrard*, Wiss Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 718; zu Olsh. Apg., p. 154, anm.; *Eichhorn*, Einl., iii. p. 31; *Ellicott*, Galatians, p. 23; *Hausrath*, Der Ap. Paulus, p. 246; *Hilgenfeld*, Galaterbr., p. 129 f.; *Lange*, Das ap. Z., ii. p. 4 f.; *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm., iv. p. 36; *Renan*, St. Paul, p. 75, n. 1; *Stap*, Origines, p. 177, n. 2; *Wieseler*, Chron. ap. Z., p. 176 f.; Br. an d. Gal., p. 90 ff.

[2] *Bengel*, Gnom. N. T., ad Gal., ii. 1; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 366, 369; *Conybeare and Howson*, Life and Eps. of St. Paul, 1856, i. p. 539 ff.; *Credner*, Einl., i. p. 314; *Hofmann*, Die heil. Schr. N. T., 2te Aufl., i. p. 81 ff.; *Holsten*, Zum ev. Paul, u. s. w., p. 272, 275, anm.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iv. p. 472; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 102; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 195; *Meyer*, Gal., p. 51; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 369; *Schrader*, Der Ap. P., i. p. 48 f., 74; v. p. 264; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 84 ff., 104, 107; *Usteri*, Br. an d. Gal., p. 39; *Winer*, P. ad Gal. Ep., p. 148 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 217.

death,—the date of the journey referred to in Acts xi. 30 is assigned to about A.D. 45. If, therefore, we count back fourteen or seventeen years, we have as the date of the conversion, on the first hypothesis, A.D. 31, and on the second, A.D. 28, neither of which of course is tenable. In order to overcome this difficulty, critics[1] at one time proposed, against the unanimous evidence of MSS., to read instead of διὰ δεκατεσσ. ἐτῶν in Gal. ii. 1, διὰ τεσσάρων ἐτῶν, "after four years;" but this violent remedy is not only generally rejected, but, even if admitted for the sake of argument, it could not establish the identity, inasmuch as the statements in Gal. ii. 1 ff, imply a much longer period of missionary activity amongst the Gentiles than Paul could possibly have had at that time, about which epoch, indeed, Barnabas is said to have sought him in Tarsus, apparently for the purpose of first commencing such a career;[2] certainly the account of his active ministry begins in the Acts only in Ch. xiii. Then, it is not possible to suppose that, if such a dispute regarding circumcision and the Gospel of the uncircumcision as is sketched in Gal. ii. had taken place on a previous occasion, it could so soon be repeated, Acts xv., and without any reference to the former transaction. Comparatively few critics, therefore, have ventured to maintain that the second visit recorded in the Epistle is the same as the second mentioned in the Acts (xi. 30), and in modern times the theory is almost entirely abandoned. If, therefore, it be admitted that Paul mentions all the journeys which he had made to Jerusalem up to the time at which he wrote, and that his second visit was not the second visit

[1] So *Grotius, Semler, Bertholdt, Kuinoel, Heinrichs, Ulrich, Böttger*, and others.

[2] Acts xi. 25 f.

of the Acts, but must be placed later, it follows clearly upon the Apostle's own assurance that the visit mentioned in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, cannot have taken place and is unhistorical, and this is the conclusion of the majority of critics,[1] including many apologists, who, whilst suggesting that, for some reason, Barnabas may alone have gone to Jerusalem without Paul, or otherwise deprecating any imputation of conscious inaccuracy to the Author, still substantially confirm the result that Paul did not on that occasion go to Jerusalem, and consequently that the statement is not historical. On the other hand, it is suggested that the additional visit to Jerusalem is inserted by the Author with a view to conciliation, by representing that Paul was in constant communication with the Apostles and community of Jerusalem, and that he acted with their approval and sympathy. It is scarcely possible to observe the peculiar variations between the narratives of the Acts and of Paul without feeling that the author of the former deliberately sacrifices the independence and individuality of the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

The great mass of critics agree in declaring that the

[1] *Anger*, De tempore in Act. Ap. ratione, p. 141 ff.; *Baur*, Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 479 f.; Paulus, i. p. 129 ff.; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 366; Beiträge, p. 55 f.; *Brandes*, Br. Gal., p. 92 ff.; *Credner*, Einl., i. p. 314 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., iii. p. 222; *Ebrard*, Wiss Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 717: zu Olsh. Apg., p. 178; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, p. 418 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Galaterbr., p. 125 f., 149 f.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iv. p. 472, 474 f., viii. p. 340; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 195; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 267, anm.; Galaterbr., p. 51 f., 58 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 146; *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm., iv. p. 34 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 178; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxii. ff.; *Schleiermacher*, Einl. N. T., p. 368 f.; *Schrader*, Der. Ap. P., v. p. 264 f., 537; *Stap*, Origines, p. 174 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 98 ff.; *Tjeenk-Willink*, Justin. Mart., p. 32, n.; *Usteri*, Br. an die Gal., p. 35 ff.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 547; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 218 ff. Cf. *Ellicott*, Galatians, p. 23; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 289 f.; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 71—74.

second visit described in the Epistle is identical with the third recorded in the Acts (xv.), although a wide difference of opinion exists amongst them as to the historical value of the account contained in the latter. This general agreement renders it unnecessary for us to enter at any length into the arguments which establish the identity, and we shall content ourselves with very concisely stating some of the chief reasons for this conclusion. The date in both cases corresponds, whilst there are insuperable chronological objections to identifying the second journey of the Epistle with any earlier or later visit mentioned in Acts. We have referred to other reasons against its being placed earlier than the third visit of Acts, and there are still stronger objections to its being dated after the third. It is impossible, considering the object of the Apostle, that he could have passed over in silence such a visit as that described Acts xv., and the only alternative would be to date it later than the composition of the Epistle, to which the narrative of the Acts as well as all other known facts would be irreconcilably opposed. On the other hand, the date, the actors, the cause of dispute, and probably the place (Antioch) in which that dispute originated, so closely correspond, that it is incredible that such a coincidence of circumstances should again have occurred.

Without anticipating our comparison of the two accounts of this visit, we must here at least remark that the discrepancies are so great that not only have apologetic critics, as we have indicated, adopted the theory that the second visit of the Epistle is not the same as the third of the Acts, but is identical with the second (xi. 30), of which so few particulars are given; but

others, and notably Wieseler,[1] have maintained it to have been the same as that described in Acts xviii. 21 ff., whilst Paley and others[2] have been led to the hypothesis that the visit in question does not correspond with any of the visits actually recorded in the Acts, but is one which is not referred to at all in that work. These

[1] Chron. ap. Zeit., p. 179 ff., p. 201 ff.; Br. Pauli an d. Galater, p. 93 ff.

[2] *Paley*, Evidences, and Horæ Paul., ch. v. Nos. 2, 10, p. 367 f., 382 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, i. p. 75 ff., 122 ff. It may be well to quote the following passage from Paley, a witness whose testimony will scarcely be suspected of unorthodox partiality: "It must not be dissembled that the comparison of our epistle with the history presents some difficulties, or to say the least, some questions of considerable magnitude. It may be doubted, in the first place, to what journey the words which open the second chapter of the Epistle—'then fourteen years afterwards I went unto Jerusalem'—relate. That which best corresponds with the date, and that to which most interpreters apply the passage, is the journey of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, when they went thither from Antioch, upon the business of the Gentile converts, and which journey produced the famous council and decree recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Acts. To me this opinion appears to be encumbered with strong objections. In the Epistle, Paul tells us that 'he went up by revelation' (ii. 2). In the Acts we read that he was sent by the Church of Antioch. 'After no small dissension and disputation, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and elders about this question' (xv. 2). This is not very reconcilable. In the Epistle St. Paul writes that, when he came to Jerusalem, 'he communicated that Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation' (ii. 2). If by 'that Gospel' he meant the immunity of the Gentile Christians from the Jewish law (and I know not what else it can mean), it is not easy to conceive how he should communicate that privately, which was the subject of his public message. But a yet greater difficulty remains—viz., that in the account which the Epistle gives of what passed upon this visit at Jerusalem, no notice is taken of the deliberation and decree which are recorded in the Acts, and which, according to that history, formed the business for the sake of which the journey was undertaken. The mention of the council and of its determination, whilst the Apostle was relating his proceedings at Jerusalem, could hardly have been avoided if in truth the narrative belonged to the same journey. To me it appears more probable that Paul and Barnabas had taken some journey to Jerusalem, the mention of which is omitted in the Acts. . . ." Evidences, and Horæ Paulinæ, ch. v. No. 10, p. 382.

theories have found very little favour, however, and we mention them solely to complete our statement of the general controversy. Considering the fulness of the report of the visit in Acts xv. and the peculiar nature of the facts stated by the Apostle himself in his letter to the Galatians, the difficulty of identifying the particular visit referred to is a phenomenon which cannot be too much considered. Is it possible, if the narrative in the Acts were really historically accurate, that any reasonable doubt could ever have existed as to its correspondence with the Apostle's statements? We may here at once say that, although many of the critics who finally decide that the visit described in Acts xv. is the same as that referred to in the second chapter of the Epistle argue that the obvious discrepancies and contradictions between the two accounts may be sufficiently explained and reconciled, this is for very strong reasons disputed,[1] and the narrative in the Acts, when tested by the authentic statements of the Apostle, pronounced inaccurate and unhistorical.

It is only necessary to read the two accounts in order to understand the grounds upon which even apologists like Paley and Wieseler feel themselves compelled

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. 129 ff., 132 ff.; Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 457 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 214 ff., 251 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1858, p. 77 ff., 317 ff.; 1860, p. 118 ff.; Galaterbr., p. 53 ff., 149 ff.; Einl., p. 227 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 340 f.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 62 ff.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 195 ff.; *Nicolas*, Études N. T., p. 254, notes 1, 3; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette, Apg., p. 216 ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 277 ff., 500 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxiv. ff.; St. Paul, p. 81, note 2; *Scholten*, Het paul. Ev., p. 448 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 544 ff.; *Schwanbeck*, Quellen, u. s. w., i. p. 32; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 116 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 69, note 2, p. 182 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 187 ff.; *Tjeenk-Willink*, Just. Mart., p. 31, n. 3; *Volkmar*, Die Rel. Jesu, p. 345 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 216 ff., 357 f. Cf. *Jowett*, The Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 330 ff., 351 f.; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 71 ff.; Stud. u. Krit., 1855, p. 551 ff.

to suppose that the Apostle is describing transactions which occurred during some visit either unmentioned or not fully related in the Acts, rather than identify it with the visit reported in the fifteenth chapter, from which it so essentially differs. The material difference is scarcely denied by any one, and explanations with a view to reconciliation have never been dispensed with. Thiersch, who has nothing better than the usual apologetic explanations to offer, does not hesitate to avow the apparent incongruities of the two narratives. "The journey," he says, "is the same, but no human ingenuity can make out that also the conference and the decree resulting from it are the same."[1] Of course he supposes that the problem is to be solved by asserting that the Apostle speaks of the private, the historian of the public, circumstances of the visit. All who maintain the historical character of the Acts must of course more or less thoroughly adopt this argument, but it is obvious that, in doing so, they admit on the one hand the general discrepancy, and on the other, if successful in establishing their position, they could do no more than show that the Epistle does not absolutely exclude the account in the Acts. Both writers profess to describe events which occurred during the same visit; both record matters of the highest interest closely bearing on the same subject; yet the two accounts are so different from each other that they can only be rescued from complete antagonism by complete separation. Supposing the Author of the Acts to be really acquainted with the occurrences of this visit, and to have intended to give a plain unvarnished account of them, the unconscious ingenuity with which he has omitted the important facts mentioned by Paul

[1] *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Zeitalter, p. 129.

and eliminated the whole of the Apostle's individuality would indeed be as remarkable as it is unfortunate. But supposing the Apostle Paul to have been aware of the formal proceedings narrated in the Acts, characterized by such unanimity and liberal Christian feeling, it would be still more astonishing and unfortunate that he has not only silently passed them over, but has conveyed so singularly different an impression of his visit.[1] As the Apostle certainly could not have been acquainted with the Acts, his silence regarding the council and its momentous decree, as well as his ignorance of the unbroken harmony which prevailed are perfectly intelligible. He of course only knew and described what actually occurred. The Author of the Acts, however, might and must have known the Epistle to the Galatians, and the ingenuity with which the tone and details of the authentic report are avoided or transfigured cannot be ascribed to mere accident, but must largely be attributed to design, although also partly, it may be, to the ignorance and the pious imagination of a later age. Is it possible, for instance, that the controversy regarding the circumcision of Titus, and the dispute with Peter at Antioch, which are so prominently related in the Epistle, but present a view so different from the narrative of Acts, can have been undesignedly omitted? The violent apologetic reconciliation which is effected between the two accounts is based upon the foregone conclusion that the Author of the canonical Acts, however he may seem to deviate from the Apostle, cannot possibly contradict him or be

[1] "Our difficulty in reading this page of history arises not so much from the absence of light as from the perplexity of cross lights. The narratives of St. Luke and St. Paul only then cease to conflict, when we take into account the different positions of the writers and the different objects they had in view." *Lightfoot*, St. Paul's Ep. to the Gal., p. 294.

in error; but the preceding examination has rendered such a position untenable, and here we have not to do with a canonized "St. Luke," but with an unknown writer whose work must be judged by the ordinary rules of criticism.

According to the Acts, a most serious question is raised at Antioch. Certain men from Judæa came thither teaching: "Except ye have been circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved." After much dissension and disputation the Church of Antioch appoint that Paul and Barnabas, "and certain others of them" shall go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and elders about this question. The motive of the journey is here most distinctly and definitely described. Paul is solemnly deputed by the church to lay before the mother church of Jerusalem a difficult question, upon the answer to which turns the whole future of Christianity. Paul's account, however, gives a very different complexion to the visit:—"Then, after fourteen years, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus also with me. But I went up according to revelation (*κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*) and communicated to them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles," &c. Paley might well say:—"This is not very reconcilable."[1] It is argued,[2] that the two state-

[1] Horæ Paul., ch. v. No. x. See back, p. 223, note 2.

[2] "Here, however, there is no contradiction. The historian naturally records the external impulse which led to the mission; the Apostle himself states his inward motive. 'What I did,' he says, 'I did not owing to circumstances, not as yielding to pressure, not in deference to others, but because the Spirit of God told me it was right.' The very stress which he lays on this revelation seems to show that other influences were at work" (!). *Lightfoot*, St. P. Ep. to the Gal., p. 124. Dr. Lightfoot quotes as parallel cases, suggesting how the one motive might supplement the other, Acts, ix. 29, 30; cf. xxii. 17, xiii. 2—4, and xv. 28. It is unfortunate that all these "parallel cases" are taken from the work whose accuracy is in question, and that the first is actually discredited by the Apostle's own

ments may supplement each other; that the revelation may have been made to the Church of Antioch and have led to the mission; or that, being made to Paul, it may have decided him to undertake it. If, however, we admit that the essence of truth consists not in the mere letter but in the spirit of what is stated, it seems impossible to reconcile these accounts. It might be granted that a historian, giving a report of events which had occurred, might omit some secret motive actuating the conduct even of one of the principal persons with whom he has to do; but that the Apostle, under the actual circumstances, and while protesting: "Now the things which I am writing unto you, behold, before God, I lie not!" should altogether suppress the important official character of his journey to Jerusalem, and give it the distinct colour of a visit voluntarily and independently made *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*, is inconceivable. As we proceed it will become apparent that the divergence between the two accounts is systematic and fundamental; but we may here so far anticipate as to point out that the Apostle explicitly excludes an official visit not only by stating an "inward motive," and omitting all mention of a public object, but by the expression:—"and communicated to them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to those who," &c. To quote Paley's words: "If by 'that Gospel,' he meant the immunity of the Gentile Christians from the Jewish law (and I know not what else it can mean), it is not easy to conceive how he should communicate that privately, which was the subject of his public message;"[1] and

account, whilst the others are open to equally strong objections. See also *Alford*, Greek Test., ii. proleg. p. 27, iii. p. 12; *Meyer*, Br. an die Gal., p. 61 f.

[1] Horæ Paul., ch. v., No. x.

we may add, how he should so absolutely alter the whole character of his visit. In the Acts he is an ambassador charged with a most important mission; in the Epistle he is Paul the Apostle, moved solely by his own reasons again to visit Jerusalem. The Author of the Acts, however, who is supposed to record only the external circumstances, when tested is found to do so very imperfectly, for he omits all mention of Titus, who is conjectured to be tacitly included in the "certain others of them," who were appointed by the Church to accompany Paul, and he is altogether silent regarding the strenuous effort to enforce the rite of circumcision in his case, upon which the Apostle lays so much stress. The Apostle, who throughout maintains his simply independent attitude, mentions his taking Titus with him as a purely voluntary act, and certainly conveys no impression that he also was delegated by the Church. We shall presently see how significant the suppression of Titus is in connection with the Author's transformation of the circumstances of the visit. In affirming that he went up "according to revelation," Paul proceeds in the very spirit in which he began to write this epistle. He continues simply to assert his independence and equality with the elder Apostles. In speaking of his first journey he has this object in view, and he states precisely the duration of his visit and whom he saw. If he had suppressed the official character of this second visit and the fact that he submitted for the decision of the Apostles and elders the question of the immunity of the Gentile converts from circumcision, and thus curtly ascribed his going to a revelation, he would have compromised himself in a very serious manner, and exposed himself to a charge of disingenuousness of which his enemies would not have

failed to take advantage. But, whether we consider the evidence of the Apostle himself in speaking of this visit, the absence of all external allusion to the supposed proceedings when reference to them would have been not only most appropriate but was almost necessary, the practical contradiction of the whole narrative implied in the subsequent conduct of Peter at Antioch, or the inconsistency of the conduct attributed in it to Paul himself, we are forced back to the natural conclusion that the Apostle does not suppress anything, and does not give so absurdly partial an account of his visit as would be the case if the narrative in the Acts be historical, but that, in a few rapid powerful lines, he completes a suggestive sketch of its chief characteristics. This becomes more apparent at every step we take in our comparison of the two narratives.

If we pass on to the next stage of the proceedings, we find an equally striking divergence between the two writers, and it must not escape attention that the variations are not merely incidental but are thorough and consecutive. According to the Acts, there was a solemn congress held in Jerusalem, on which occasion the Apostles and elders and the Church being assembled, the question whether it was necessary that the Gentiles should be circumcised and bound to keep the law of Moses was fully discussed, and a formal resolution finally adopted by the meeting. The proceedings in fact constitute what has always been regarded as the first Council of the Christian Church. The account in the Epistle does not seem to betray any knowledge of such a congress.[1] The Apostle himself says merely:—"But I

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 152 ff.; Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 474 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 216 f., 253; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 196;

went according to revelation and communicated to them (*αὐτοῖς*) the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which seemed (to be something) (*κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*)."[1] The usual apologetic explanation, as we have already mentioned, is that whilst more or less distinctly the Author of Acts indicates private conferences, and Paul a public assembly, the former chiefly confines his attention to the general congress and the latter to the more private incidents of his visit.[2] The opinion that the Author of Acts "alludes in a general way to conferences and discussions preceding the congress,"[3] is based upon the statement xv. 4, 5: "And when they came to Jerusalem they were received by the Church and by the Apostles and the elders, and declared all that God did with them. But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees, who believed, saying: That it is necessary to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses. And the Apostles and the elders came together to see regarding this matter. And when there had been much disputation, Peter rose up and said," &c. If it be admitted that more than one meeting is here indicated, it is clear that the words cannot be legitimately strained into a reference to more

Overbeck, zu de Wette, Apg., p. 218 f.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 188 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 184 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 226 f.

[1] Gal. ii. 2.

[2] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 162 f.; iii. p. 12 f.; *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 461 ff.; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 371; *Ebrard*, ev. Gesch., p. 699 f.; *Ellicott*, Galatians, p. 24; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 434 f., anm. 2; *Hofmann*, Die heil. Schr. N. T., i. p. 128 ff.; *Lange*, Das ap. Z., i. p. 100 f., ii. p. 178 ff.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 397 f.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 294 ff.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 103, 124 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 329 f., Gal. p. 64 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 160 ff.; *Oertel*, Paulus, p. 226 ff., 232 ff.; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 458 f.; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. K., p. 150; *Schliemann*, Clementinen, p. 388 f.; *Theirsch*, K. im ap. Z., p. 129 f.; *Trip*, Paulus, p. 84 ff.

[3] *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 125.

than two conferences. The first of these is a general meeting of the Apostles and elders and of the Church to receive the delegates from Antioch, and the second is an equally general and public conference (verse 6): not only are the Apostles and elders present but also the general body of Christians, as clearly appears from the statement (ver. 12) that, after the speech of Peter, "all the multitude (πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος) kept silence."[1] The "much disputation" evidently takes place on the occasion when the Apostles and elders are gathered together to consider the matter. If, therefore, two meetings can be maintained from the narrative in Acts, both are emphatically public and general, and neither, therefore, the private conference of the Epistle. The main fact that the Author of the Acts describes a general congress of the Church as taking place is never called in question.

On the other hand, few who appreciate the nature of the discrepancy which we are discussing will feel that the difficulty is solved by suggesting that there is space for the insertion of other incidents in the Apostle's narrative. It is rather late now to interpolate a general Council of the Church into the pauses of the Galatian letter. To suppose that the communications of Paul to the "Pillar" Apostles, and the distressing debate regarding the circumcision of Titus, may be inferred between the lines of the account in the Acts, is a bold effort of imagination; but it is far from being as hopeless as an attempt to reconcile the discrepancy by thrusting the important public congress into some corner of the

[1] It has been pertinently asked how it is possible that such a meeting could have taken place? What room could have been found to contain the assembly. Cf. *Reuss*, N. Rev. de Théol., 1858, ii. p. 36.

Apostle's statement. In so far as any argument is advanced in support of the assertion that Paul's expression implies something more than the private conference, it is based upon the reference intended in the words ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς. When Paul says he went up to Jerusalem and communicated "to them" his Gospel, but privately τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, whom does he mean to indicate by the αὐτοῖς? Does he refer to the Christian community of Jerusalem, or to the Apostles themselves? It is pretty generally admitted that either application is permissible; but whilst a majority of apologetic, together with some independent, critics adopt the former,[1] not a few consider, as Chrysostom, Œcumenius, and Calvin did before them, that Paul more probably referred to the Apostles.[2] In favour of the former there is the fact, it is argued, that the αὐτοῖς is used immediately after the statement that the Apostle went up "to Jerusalem," and that it may be more natural to conclude that he speaks of the Christians there, more especially as he seems to distinguish between the communication made αὐτοῖς and κατ' ἰδίαν τοῖς δοκοῦσιν;[3] and, in support of this, "they"

[1] *Alford*, Gk. Test., iii. p. 12 f.; *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Br. an d. Gal., p. 36; *Ellicott*, Galatians, p. 24; *Hilgenfeld*, Galaterbr., p. 55 f., 130; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iv. p. 472; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 397 f.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 294 f.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 103, 125; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 196; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 329; Gal. br., p. 62; *Oertel*, Paulus, p. 232; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 502; *Usteri*, Br. an die Gal., p. 44; *De Wette*, Br. an die Gal., p. 22; *Wieseler*, Br. an die Gal., p. 98 f., 100, 106; *Winer*, P. ad Gal. Ep., p. 54; Gramm. N. T. Sprach., p. 587. Cf. *Stap*, Origines, p. 185 f.

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 133 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 216 f.; *Jowett*, Eps. of St. P., i. p. 236; *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm., iv. p. 38; *Reuss*, Rev. de Théol., 1858, ii. p. 340 f. Cf. *Zeller*, Apg., p. 226, anm. 2.

[3] Meyer argues, not without force, that if Paul had not by κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ intended to distinguish a different communication, he must have said: ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς, κ. τ. λ., ἀνεθέμην δὲ τοῖς δοκ. omitting the distinguishing κατ' ἰδίαν. Br. an die Gal., p. 62, anm.

in Gal. i. 23, 24, is, though we think without propriety, referred to. It is, on the other hand, urged that it is very unlikely that the Apostle would in such a way communicate his Gospel to the whole community, and that in the expressions used he indicates no special transaction, but that the *ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς* is merely an indefinite statement for which he immediately substitutes the more precise *κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν.*[1] It is quite certain that there is no mention of the Christian community of Jerusalem to which the *αὐτοῖς* can with any real grammatical necessity be referred; but when the whole purport of the first part of the Apostle's letter is considered the reference to the Apostles in the *αὐτοῖς* becomes clearer. Paul is protesting the independence of his Gospel, and that he did not receive it from man but from Jesus Christ. He wishes to show that he was not taught by the Apostles nor dependent upon them. He states that after his conversion he did not go to those who were Apostles before him, but, on the contrary, went away to Arabia, and only three years after he went up to Jerusalem, and then only for the purpose of making the acquaintance of Peter, and on that occasion other of the Apostles saw he none save James the Lord's brother. After fourteen years, he continues to recount, he again went up to Jerusalem, but according to revelation, and communicated to them, *i.e.* to the Apostles, the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles. The Apostles

[1] An able and impartial critic, Reuss, attempts to reconcile the two accounts by arguing that such a question could not possibly have been laid before and decided by the whole community. He therefore supposes that private conferences only took place. This "reconciliation," however, is excluded by the account in Acts, which so distinctly represents a large public congress, and it by no means lessens the fundamental discrepancy of the narratives. Cf. *Reuss*, N. Rev. de Théol., 1858, ii. 334 ff., 1859, iii. p. 62 ff.

have been in the writer's mind throughout, but in the impetuous flow of his ideas, which in the first two chapters of this epistle outrun the pen, the sentences become involved. It must be admitted, finally, that the reference intended is a matter of opinion and cannot be authoritatively settled. If we suppose it to refer to the community of Jerusalem, taking thus the more favourable construction, how would this affect the question? Can it be maintained that in this casual and indefinite "to them" we have any confirmation of the general congress of the Acts, with its debates, its solemn settlement of that momentous proposition regarding the Gentile Christians, and its important decree? It is impossible to credit that, in saying that he "communicated to them" the Gospel which he preached amongst the Gentiles, the Apostle referred to a Council like that described in the Acts, to which, as a delegate from the Church of Antioch, he submitted the question of the conditions upon which the Gentiles were to be admitted into the Church, and tacitly accepted their decision.[1] Even if it be assumed that the Apostle makes this slight passing allusion to some meeting different from his conference with the pillar Apostles, it could not have been a general congress assembled for the purpose stated in the Acts and characterised by such proceedings. The discrepancy between the two narratives is not lessened by any supposed indication either in the Epistle or in the Acts of other incidents than those actually described. The suggestion that the dispute about Titus involved some pub-

[1] It is unnecessary that we should here discuss the meaning of the Apostle's words: "lest by any means I might be running or have run in vain." Critics are generally agreed that they express no doubt in the Apostle's mind, and that they cannot be taken as a submission, in any dependent sense, of his views to the elder Apostles.

licity does not avail, for the greater the publicity and importance of the episode the greater the difficulty of explaining the total silence regarding it of the Author of Acts. The more closely the two statements are compared the more apparent does it become that the Author describes proceedings which are totally different in general character, in details, and in spirit, from those so vividly sketched by the Apostle Paul.

We shall have more to say presently regarding the irreconcilable contradiction in spirit between the whole account which is given in the Acts of this Council and the writings of Paul; but it may be more convenient, if less effective, if we for the present take the chief points in the narrative as they arise and consider how far they are supported or discredited by other data. We shall refer later to the manner in which the question which leads to the Council is represented as arising and at once proceed to the speech of Peter. After there had been much disputation as to whether the Gentile Christians must necessarily be circumcised and required to observe the Mosaic law, it is stated that Peter rose up and said: xv. 7. "Men (and) brethren, ye know that a good while ago God made choice among you that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel and believe. 8. And God which knoweth the hearts bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit even as unto us; 9. and put no distinction between us and them, having purified their hearts by the faith. 10. Now, therefore, why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? 11. But by the grace of our Lord Jesus we believe we are saved even as also they."[1]

[1] Acts, xv. 7. *Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων*

The liberality of the sentiments thus put into the mouth of Peter requires no demonstration, and there is here an explicit expression of convictions, which we must, from his own words, consider to be the permanent and mature views of the Apostle, dating as they do "from ancient days" (*ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων*) and originating in so striking and supernatural a manner. We may, therefore, expect that whenever we meet with an authentic record of Peter's opinions and conduct elsewhere, they should exhibit the impress of such advanced and divinely imparted views. The statement which Peter makes: that God had a good while before selected him that the Gentiles by his voice should hear the Gospel, is of course a reference to the case of Cornelius, and this unites the fortunes of the speech and proceedings of the Council with that episode. We have seen how little ground there is for considering that narrative, with its elaborate tissue of miracles, historical. The speech which adopts it is thus discredited, and all other circumstances confirm the conclusion that the speech is not authentic.[1] If the name of Peter were erased and that of Paul substituted, the sentiments expressed would be singularly appropriate. We should have the

ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ πιστεῦσαι. 8. *καὶ ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς, δοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν,* 9. *καὶ οὐδὲν διέκρινεν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν, τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν.* 10. *νῦν οὖν τί πειράζετε τὸν θεόν, ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν μαθητῶν, ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι;* 11. *ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι καθ' ὃν τρόπον κἀκεῖνοι.*

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 132 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 216 ff. 253; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 197 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 225; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 505 f.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxvii.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 544 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 117 ff., ii. p. 106 f.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 128 f.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 189 ff. 196 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 230 ff.

divinely appointed Apostle of the Gentiles advocating complete immunity from the Mosaic law, and enunciating Pauline principles in peculiarly Pauline terms. When Peter declares that "God put no distinction between us (Jews) and them (Gentiles), purifying their hearts by faith,[1] but by the grace (χάρις) of our Lord Jesus Christ we believe we are saved even as also they," do we not hear Paul's sentiments, so elaborately expressed in the Epistle to the Romans and elsewhere? "For there is no difference between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord of all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved"[2] .... "justified freely by his grace (χάρις) through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."[3] And when Peter exclaims: "Why tempt ye God to put a yoke (ζυγός) upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" have we not rather a paraphrase of the words in the Epistle to the Galatians? "With liberty Christ made us free; stand fast, therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke (ζυγός) of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you that if ye be circumcised Christ will profit you nothing. But I testify again to every man who is circumcised that he is a debtor to do the whole law.[4] . For as many are of works of law are under a curse," &c.[5] These are only a few sentences of which the speech in Acts is an echo, but no attentive reader can fail to perceive that it contains in germ the whole of Pauline universalism.

[1] Cf. Rom. iv. 13.

[2] Rom. x. 12, 13; cf. Gal. iii. 26 ff.: "For ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus; ... There is neither Jew nor Greek; ... for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus."

[3] Rom. iii. 24.

[4] Gal. v. 1—3.

[5] Gal. iii. 10.

From the Pauline Author of the Acts this might fairly be expected, and if we linguistically examine the speech we have additional evidence that it is simply, like others which we have considered, a composition from his own pen. We shall, as briefly as possible, refer to every word which is not of too common occurence to require notice, and point out where they are elsewhere used. The opening ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί occurs elsewhere in the Acts 13 times, as we have already pointed out, being the favorite phrase placed in the mouth of all speakers; ἐπίστασθαι, x. 28, xviii. 25, xix. 15, 25, xx. 18, xxii. 19, xxiv, 10, xxvi. 3, 26, and elsewhere only 5 times. The phrase ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε at the beginning of a sentence has been pointed out, in connection with a similar way of expressing the personal pronoun in x. 28 ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε, and x. 37, ὑμεῖς οἴδατε, as consequently characteristic of Peter, and considered "important as shewing that these reports are not only according to the *sense* of what was said, but the words spoken, *verbatim*."[1] This is to overlook the fact that the very same words are put into the mouth of Paul. Peter commences his speech, xv. 7: ἄνδρες ἀδ., ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων, κ.τ.λ. Paul begins his speech at Miletus, xx. 18: ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε, ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας ἀφ' ἧς, κ.τ.λ.; and at Ephesus, Demetrius the silversmith commences his address, xix. 25: ἄνδρες, ἐπίστασθε ὅτι, κ.τ.λ., cf. xxiii. 15. ἀρχαῖος, xv. 21, xxi. 16; Luke ix. 8, 19; elsewhere 6 times; the expression ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων does not elsewhere occur in the New Testament, but ἡμ. ἀρχ. is common in the Septuagint, cf. Ps. xliii. 1, lxxvi. 5, cxlii. 5, Isaiah xxxvii. 26, Lament. i. 7, ii. 17, &c., &c. ἐκλέγεσθαι, i. 2, 24, vi. 5, xiii. 17, xv. 22, 25; Luke

[1] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. 163.

4 times, elsewhere 11 times, and of these the following with inf., Acts i. 24 f., xv. 22, 25, Ephes. i. 4. With the phrase ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξελέξατο [1] may be compared that of Paul, xiii. 17, ὁ θεὸς . . . ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, and 1 Cor. i. 27, in which ὁ θεὸς ἐξ. occurs twice, as well as again in the next verse, 28. διὰ τοῦ στόματος, i. 16, iii. 18, 21; iv. 25; Luke i. 70; and the whole phrase διὰ τ. στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι may be compared with the words put into Paul's mouth, xxii. 14: καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ. ἐναγγέλιον, xx. 24, in Paul's Epistles (4) 33 times, and elsewhere 42 times. Verse 8. ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεός,—in the N. T. καρδ. only occurs here and in i. 24, Σὺ κύριε καρδιογνῶστα πάντων, where it forms part of the prayer at the election of the successor to Judas. We have fully examined the speech of Peter, i. 16 ff., and shewn its unhistorical character, and that it is a free composition by the Author of the Acts; the prayer of the assembly is not ascribed to Peter in the work itself, though apologists, grasping at the καρδιογνώστης, assert that it must have been delivered by that Apostle; but, with the preceding speech, the prayer also must be attributed to the pen of the Author; and if it be maintained that Peter spoke in the Aramaic tongue [2] it is useless to discuss the word at all, which of course in that case must be allowed to belong to the Author. μαρτυρεῖν, Acts 12 times, Luke 2, rest frequently; with the phrase ὁ θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς may be compared Paul's words in xiii. 22, ᾧ καὶ (ὁ θεὸς) εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας. *Verse* 9, διακρίνειν, x. 20, xi. 2, 12, Paul 7 times, &c.

[1] We need not discuss ἐξ. ἐν ὑμῖν (or ἡμῖν) which de Wette, Ewald, and others take for a Hebraism, but Winer (§ 32, 3), Meyer and others defend.

[2] . . . den selbstverständlich ist's (gegen *Lange* u. Aeltere) dass Petrus nicht Griechish, sondern Aramäisch geredet hat. *Meyer*, Apg., p. 39.

μεταξύ, xii. 6, xiii. 42; Luke xi. 51, xvi. 26; rest 4 times. τε καί, Acts 27 times, Luke 3, Paul 9, rest 15 times; τε . . . καί Acts 33 times, Luke 5, Paul 4, rest 10 times—τε καί is clearly characteristic of the author. πίστις, Acts 15, Luke 11 times, rest very frequently. καθαρίζειν, x. 15, xi. 9; Luke 7, and elsewhere 20 times. νῦν οὖν, x. 33, xvi. 36, xxiii. 15; an expression not found elsewhere in the New Testament, and which is also indicative of the Author's composition. *Verse* 10, πειράζειν, v. 9, xvi. 7, xxiv. 6; Luke iv. 2, xi. 16, xx. 23, rest frequently; the question of Jesus in Luke and the parallel passages, τί με πειράζετε; will occur to every one. ἐπιτιθέναι, Acts 12, Luke 6 times, the rest frequently. ζυγός does not occur elsewhere, either in the Acts or third Gospel, but it is used precisely in the same sense by Paul, Gal. v. 1, in a passage to which we have called attention a few pages back [1] in connection with this speech. τράχηλος, xx. 37, Luke xv. 20, xvii. 2; Romans xvi. 4, Matth. xviii. 6, Mark ix. 42; ἐπὶ τὸν τραχ. occurs 4 times. ἰσχύειν, vi. 10, xix. 16, 20, xxv. 7, xxvii. 16; Luke 8 times and elsewhere 15 times. βαστάζειν, iii. 2, ix. 15, xxi. 35; Luke 5, Paul 6, rest 12 times. *Verse* 11, χάρις, Acts 17 times, Luke 8, Paul 61 times, rest frequently. πιστεύειν, Acts 38, Luke 9 times, rest frequently. σώζειν, Acts 12, Luke 18 times, rest frequently. καθ' ὃν τρόπον, is also put into the mouth of Paul, xxvii. 25, and is not elsewhere found in the New Testament; ὃν τρόπον, i. 11, vii. 28; Luke xiii. 34; Matth. xxiii. 37, 2 Tim. iii. 8. κἀκεῖνος, v. 37, xviii. 19; Luke xi. 7, 42, xx. 11, xxii. 12, and elsewhere in the New Testament 17 times. It cannot be doubted that the language of this speech is that of the Author of the Acts, and no serious attempt has ever

[1] p. 238.

been made to show that it is the language of Peter. If it be asserted that, in the form before us, it is a translation, there is not the slightest evidence to support the assertion; and it has to contend with the unfortunate circumstance that, in the supposed process, the words of Peter have not only become the words of the Author, but his thoughts the thoughts of Paul.

We may now inquire whether we find in authentic records of the Apostle Peter's conduct and views any confirmation of the liberality which is attributed to him in the Acts. He is here represented as proposing the emancipation of Gentile Converts from the Mosaic law: does this accord with the statements of the Apostle Paul and with such information as we can elsewhere gather regarding Peter? Very much the contrary.

Peter in this speech claims that, long before, God had selected him to make known the Gospel to the Gentiles, but Paul emphatically distinguishes him as the Apostle of the Circumcision; and although, accepting facts which had actually taken place and could not be prevented, Peter with James and John gave Paul right hands of fellowship, he remained as he had been before, Apostle of the Circumcision[1] and, as we shall see, did not practise the liberality which he is said to have preached. Very shortly after the Council described in the Acts, there occurred the celebrated dispute between him and Paul which the latter proceeds to describe immediately after the visit to Jerusalem: "But when Cephas came to Antioch," he writes, "I withstood him to the face, for he was condemned. For before certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they came, he withdrew and separated himself, fear-

[1] Gal. ii. 7 ff.

ing those of the Circumcision. And the other Jews also joined in his hypocrisy, insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, I said unto Cephas before all: If thou being a Jew livest (ζῇς) after the manner of Gentiles and not after the manner of Jews, how compellest (ἀναγκάζεις) thou the Gentiles to adopt the customs of the Jews? (ἰουδαΐζειν)"[1] Before commenting upon this, it is necessary to say a few words as to the significance of Peter's conduct and of Paul's rebuke, regarding which there is some difference of opinion.[2] Are we to understand from this that Peter, as a general rule, at Antioch and elsewhere, with enlightened emancipation from Jewish prejudices, lived as a Gentile and in full communion with Gentile Christians?[3] Meyer[4] and others argue that by the use of the present ζῇς, the Apostle indicates a continuous practice based upon principle, and that the ζῆν is not the mere moral life, but includes the external social observances of christian community: the object, in fact, being to show that upon principle Peter held the advanced liberal views of Paul, and that the fault which he committed in withdrawing from free intercourse with the Gentile Christians was momentary, and merely the result of "occasional timidity and weakness." This theory cannot bear the test of examination. The account of Paul is clearly this: *when Cephas came to Antioch*, the strong-

[1] Gal. ii. 11—14.

[2] Cf. *Lightfoot*, St. Paul's Ep. to the Gal., 338.

[3] *Hilgenfeld* argues that in speaking of "eating with them," Paul refers to the Agape, the meals of the Christians which had a religious significance. Although this is well worthy of consideration, it is not necessary for us here to go into the question. Cf. Galaterbrief, p. 59 ff. Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1858, p. 87 ff.

[4] Br. an die Gal., 98 f.

hold of Gentile Christianity, *before certain men came from James*, he ate with the Gentiles, but as soon as these emissaries arrived he withdrew, "fearing those of the circumcision." Had his normal custom been to live like the Gentiles, how is it possible that he could have, on this occasion only, feared those of the circumcision? His practice must have been notorious; and had he, moreover, actually expressed such opinions in the congress of Jerusalem, his confession of faith having been so publicly made, and so unanimously approved by the Church, there could not have been any conceivable cause for such timidity. The fact evidently is, on the contrary, that Peter, under the influence of Paul, was induced for the time to hold free communion with the Gentile Christians; but as soon as the emissaries of James appeared on the scene, he became alarmed at this departure from his principles, and fell back again into his normal practice. If the present ζῇς be taken to indicate continuous habit of life, the present ἀναγκάζεις very much more than neutralizes it. Paul with his usual uncompromising frankness rebukes the vacillation of Peter: by adopting even for a time fellowship with the Gentiles, Peter has practically recognised its validity, has been guilty of hypocrisy in withdrawing from his concession on the arrival of the followers of James, and is condemned; but after such a concession he cannot legitimately demand that Gentile Converts should "judaize." It is obvious that whilst Peter lived as a Gentile, he could not have been compelling the Gentiles to adopt Judaism. Paul, therefore, in saying: "Why compellest thou (ἀναγκάζεις) the Gentiles to adopt the customs of the Jews? (ἰουδαΐζειν)," very distinctly intimates that the normal practice of Peter was to compel

Gentile Christians to adopt Judaism. There is no escaping this conclusion for, after all specious reasoning to the contrary is exhausted, there remains the simple fact that Peter, when placed in a dilemma on the arrival of the emissaries of James, and forced to decide whether he will continue to live as a Gentile or as a Jew, adopts the latter alternative, and as Paul tells us "compels" (in the present) the Gentiles to judaize. A stronger indication of his views could scarcely have been given. Not a word is said which in the remotest degree implies that Peter yielded to the vehement protests of Paul, but on the contrary we must undoubtedly conclude that he did not; for it is impossible to suppose that Paul would not have stated a fact so pertinent to his argument, had the elder Apostle been induced by his remonstrance to walk uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel which Paul preached, and both to teach and practice Christian universalism. We shall have abundant reason, apart from this, to conclude that Peter did not yield, and it is no false indication of this, that, a century after, we find the Clementine Homilies expressing the bitterness of the Petrine party against the Apostle of the Gentiles for this very rebuke, and representing Peter as following his course from city to city for the purpose of refuting Paul's unorthodox teaching. It is contended that Peter's conduct at Antioch is quite consistent with his denial of his master related in the Gospels, and, therefore, that it might well have taken place even after his adoption of liberal principles, such momentary weakness being in fact characteristic. Those who argue in this way, however, forget that the denial of Jesus, as described in the Gospels, proceeded from the fear of death, and that such a reply to a merely compromising question which did not directly

involve principles, is a very different thing from conduct like that at Antioch where, under one influence, a line of action was temporarily adopted which ratified views upon which the opinion of the Church was divided, and then abandoned merely from fear of the disapproval of those of the circumcision. The Author of the Acts passes over this altercation in complete silence. No one has ever called in question the authenticity of the account which Paul gives of it. If Peter had the courage to make such a speech at the Council in the very capital of Judaic christianity, and in the presence of James and the whole church, how could he possibly, from fear of a few men from Jerusalem, have shown such pusillanimity in Antioch, where Paul and the mass of Christians supported him? If the unanimous decision of the Council had really been a fact, how easily he might have silenced any objections by an appeal to that which had "seemed good to the Holy Spirit" and to the Church! But there is not the slightest knowledge of the Council and its decree betrayed either by those who came from James, or by Peter, or Paul. The episode at Antioch is inconsistent with the conduct and words ascribed to Peter in the Acts, and contradicts the narrative in the fifteenth chapter which we are examining.[1]

The Author of the Acts states that after Peter had spoken, "all the multitude kept silence and were hearing

[1] *Baur*, K. G., i. p. 52 f.; Paulus, i. p. 146 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 220 f., 222; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 415 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1858, p. 87 ff.; 1860, p. 140 ff.; Der Kanon, p. 204; Einl., p. 232 f.; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w., p. 359 ff.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 197; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 221 f.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxv. ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 117 ff., 127 ff.; ii. p. 106 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 196; *Usteri*, Br. an d. Gal., p. 37 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 233 ff. Cf. *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 106 ff.; *Wieseler*, Br. an d. Gal., p. 153 ff., 157 ff.

Barnabas and Paul declaring what signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them."[1] We shall not at present pause to consider this statement, nor the *rôle* which Paul is made to play in the whole transaction, beyond pointing out that, on an occasion when such a subject as the circumcision of the Gentiles and their subjection to the Mosaic law was being discussed, nothing could be more opposed to nature than to suppose that a man like the Author of the Epistle to the Galatians could have assumed so passive and subordinate an attitude.[2] After Barnabas and Paul had spoken, James is represented as saying: "Men (and) brethren, hear me. Simeon declared how God at first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And with this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written: 'After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which has fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and will set it up: that the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name has been called, saith the Lord who doeth these things, known from the beginning.' Wherefore, I judge that we trouble not those from among the Gentiles who are turning to God; but that we write unto them that they abstain from the pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. For Moses from generations of old hath in every city those who preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath."[3] There are many reasons for which this

[1] xv. 12.

[2] *Overbeck*, zu de Wette's K. Erkl. Apostelgesch., p. 227.

[3] "Ανδρες ἀδελφοί, ἀκούσατέ μου. Συμεὼν ἐξηγήσατο καθὼς πρῶτον ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. καὶ τούτῳ συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν, καθὼς γέγραπται, κ.τ.λ. (Greek below.) διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω μὴ παρενοχλεῖν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπιστρέφουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ἀλλὰ ἐπιστεῖλαι

speech also must be pronounced inauthentic.[1] It may be observed, in passing, that James completely disregards the statement which Barnabas and Paul are supposed to make as to what God had wrought by them among the Gentiles; and, ignoring their intervention, he directly refers to the preceding speech of Peter claiming to have first been selected to convert the Gentiles. We shall reserve discussion of the conditions which James proposes to impose upon Gentile Christians till we come to the apostolic decree which embodies them. The precise signification of the sentence with which (ver. 21) he concludes has been much debated, but need not detain us long. Whatever may be said of the liberal part of the speech it is obvious that the Author has been more true to the spirit of the time in conceiving this and other portions of it, than in composing the speech of Peter. The continued observance of the Mosaic ritual, and the identity of the synagogue with the Christian Church are correctly indicated; and when James is again represented (xxi. 20 ff.) as advising Paul to join those who had a vow, in order to prove that he himself walked orderly and was an observer of the law, and did not teach the Jews to apostatize from Moses and abandon the rite of circumcision, he is consistent in his portrait. It is nevertheless clear that, however we may read the restrictions which James proposes

αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλισγημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων καὶ τῆς πορνείας καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος. Μωϋσῆς γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρύσσοντας αὐτὸν ἔχει ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος. Acts xv. 13-20.

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 135 ff., 150 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 221, 252 f.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's Bib. Lex., i. p. 198 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., 216, 222, 227 ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Paulinismus, p. 505 f.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxv., note 1; xxxvii.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 117 ff., ii. p. 106 f.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 189 ff., 196 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 232 ff.

to impose upon Gentile Christians, the Author of Acts intends them to be considered as a most liberal and almost complete concession of immunity. "I judge," he makes James say, "that we trouble not those from among the Gentiles who are turning to God;" and again on the second occasion of which we have just been speaking, in referring to the decree, a contrast is drawn between the Christian Jews, from whom observance of the law is demanded, and the Gentiles, who are only expected to follow the prescriptions of the decree. James is represented as supporting the statement of Peter how God visited the Gentiles by "the words of the Prophets," quoting a passage from Amos. ix. 11, 12. It is difficult to see how the words, even as quoted, apply to the case at all, but this is immaterial. Loose reasoning can certainly not be taken as a mark of inauthenticity. It is much more to the point that James, addressing an assembly of Apostles and elders in Jerusalem, quotes the prophet Amos freely from the Septuagint version,[1] which differs widely in the latter and more important part from the Hebrew text.[2] The passage in the Hebrew reads: ix. 11. "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old, 12. that they may possess the remnant of

[1] "St. James and St. Luke *adopt* that Version as not contrary to the mind of Spirit, and indeed as expressing that mind," &c., &c. *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., The Acts, p. 113.

[2] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 165; *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 436 ff.; *Beelen*, Act. Apost., p. 382 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. O. T., iii. p. 259; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 436, anm. 2; *Hengstenberg*, Christol. d. A. T. 2 Aufl., i. p. 454 f.; *Kuenen*, De Profeten, ii. p. 211 f.; *Kuinoel*, Comm. N. T., iv. p. 506; *Lightfoot*, Works, viii. p. 475 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 333 f.; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 211 ff.; *Reuss*, Rev. de Théol., 1859, iii. p. 84 f.; *Stier*, Reden d. Ap., ii. p. 25, cf. 28; *De Wette*, Apg., p. 228; *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., Acts, p. 113.

Edom, and of all the heathen upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord that doeth this." The authors of the Septuagint version altered the twelfth verse into: "That the residue of men may seek after the Lord and all the Gentiles upon whom My name is called, saith the Lord who doeth these things."[1] It is perfectly clear that the prophet does not, in the original, say what James is here represented as stating, and that his own words refer to the national triumph of Israel, and not to the conversion of the Gentiles. Amos in fact prophesies that the Lord will restore the former power and glory of Israel, and that the remnant of Edom and the other nations of the theocracy shall be re-united, as they were under David. No one questions the fact that the original prophecy is altered, and those who desire to see the singular explanations of apologists may refer to some of the works indicated.[2] The question as to whether James or the Author of the Acts is responsible for the adoption of the Septuagint version is felt to be a serious problem. Some critics affirm that in all probability James must have spoken in Aramaic;[3] whilst others maintain that he delivered this

[1] The whole passage in the lxx. reads: *Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν, καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς, καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω, καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτὴν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος.* 12. *Ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον* (Cod. Alex.) *καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, λέγει κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα* (Cod. Alex. om. *πάντα*). The passage in the speech of James reads: 16. *Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυεὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν, καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν,* 17. *ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, λέγει κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα* 18. *γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος.* The rest of the verse, *ἐστὶ τῷ θεῷ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*, which stands in the A.V. is omitted by ℵ, B, C, and other important codices, but Cod. A and D have *τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ*, the latter having also *ἐστιν*.

[2] See p. 249, note 2.

[3] *Bengel*, Gnom. N. T., p. 576; *Lightfoot*, Works, viii. p. 474 f.; *Meyer*,

address in Greek.[1] In the one case, it is supposed that he quoted the original Hebrew and that the Author of the Acts or the document from which he derived his report may have used the Septuagint; and in the other, it is suggested that the LXX. may have had another and more correct reading before them, for it is supposed impossible that James himself could have quoted a version which was actually different from the original Hebrew. These and many other similar explanations, into which we need not go, do little to remove the difficulty presented by the fact itself. To suppose that our Hebrew texts are erroneous in order to justify the speech is a proceeding which does not require remark. It will be remembered that, in the Acts, the Septuagint is always employed in quotations from the Old Testament, and that this is by no means the only place in which that version is used when it departs from the original. It is difficult to conceive that any intelligent Jew could have quoted the Hebrew of this passage to support a proposal to free Gentile Christians from the necessity of circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic Law. It is equally difficult to suppose that James, a bigoted leader of the Judaistic party and the head of the Church of Jerusalem, could have quoted the Septuagint version of the Holy Scriptures, differing from the Hebrew, to such an assembly. It is useless to examine here the attempts to make the passage quoted a correct interpretation of the prophet's meaning, or seriously to consider the proposition that this alteration of a prophetic utterance is adopted as better

Apg., p. 334; *Stier*, Die Reden d. Ap., p. 25, anm. Cf. *Reuss*, Rev. de Théol., 1859, iii. p. 84.

[1] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 165; *Hengstenberg*, Christol. d. A. T. 2te Aufl., i. p. 455 f.; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 212.

expressing "the mind of the Spirit." If the original prophecy did not express that mind, it is rather late to amend the utterances of the prophets in the Acts of the Apostles.

We may now briefly examine the speech linguistically. *Verse* 13: The opening as usual is ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί which occurs elsewhere in the Acts 13 times as we have already mentioned; but the whole phrase ἄνδρ. ἀδ. ἀκούσατέ μου is put into the mouth of Paul in xxii. 1, ἄνδρ. ἀδ. καὶ πατέρες ἀκούσατέ μου, and with but little variation again in xiii. 16, cf. ii. 22. The use of the Hebrew form Συμεών, in speaking of Peter, has been pointed out by Bleek[1] and others, after Lightfoot,[2] as a characteristic peculiarity showing the authenticity of the speech. The same form occurs in 2 Pet. i. 1, but its use in that spurious epistle is scarcely calculated to give weight to its use here. If it be characteristic of anyone, however, its use is characteristic of the author of the third Gospel and the Acts, and in no case is it peculiarly associated with James. In addition to the instance referred to above, and Apoc. vii. 7, where the tribe of Simeon is thus named, the Jewish form Συμεών of the name Simon occurs four times only in the New Testament, and they are confined to our Author: Acts xiii. 1; Luke ii. 25, 34, iii. 30. Being acquainted with the Jewish form of the name, he made use of it in this speech probably for the effect of local colouring. ἐξηγεῖσθαι, x. 8, xv. 12, xxi. 19; Luke xxiv. 35, and nowhere else except John i. 18—it is peculiar to the Author. καθώς, Acts 11, Luke 16 times, and elsewhere frequently. πρῶτον, iii. 26, vii. 12, xi. 26, xiii. 46, xxvi. 20; Luke 10 times; Jam. iii. 17; Paul 10 times, rest fre-

[1] Einl. N. T., p. 348; Th. Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1036 f.
[2] Works, viii. p. 474 f.

quently. ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, vi. 3, vii. 23, xv. 36; Luke i. 68, 78, vii. 16; Matth. xxv. 36, 43, Hebr. ii. 6, Jam. i. 27, that is to say 7 times used by the Author and only 4 times in the rest of the New Testament; compare especially Luke i. 68, and vii. 16. λαός opposed to ἔθνη, xxvi. 17, 23. The expression ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι occurs ii. 38, iv. 17, 18, v. 28, 40; Luke ix. 48, 49, xxi. 8, xxiv. 47, and only 5 times in the rest of the New Testament. *Verse* 15: συμφωνεῖν, v. 9; Luke v. 36, and Matth. xviii. 19, xx. 2, 13 only. *Verse* 16: In this quotation from Amos, for the ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ of the Septuagint, the Author substitutes μετὰ ταῦτα, which phrase occurs elsewhere in Acts vii. 7, xiii. 20, xviii. 1; Luke v. 27, x. 1, xii. 4, xvii. 8, xviii. 4. ἀναστρέφειν, v. 22 and 9 times elsewhere. *Verse* 18: γνωστός, i. 19, ii. 14, iv. 10, 16, ix. 42, xiii. 38, xix. 17, xxviii. 22, 28=10 times in Acts; Luke ii. 44, xxiii. 49; elsewhere only in Rom. i. 19, John xviii. 15, 16,—a characteristic word. So likewise is the expression ἀπ' αἰῶνος, iii. 21, Luke i. 70; ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων occurs in Ephes. iii. 9, Col. i. 26. These words are added to the passage quoted from the Septuagint. *Verse* 19: διό is used 11 times in Acts; Luke i. 35, vii. 7; by Paul 18 times, Ep. Jam. twice, and elsewhere 25 times. κρίνειν, 22 times in Acts; Luke 6 times, Paul 37 times, Ep. Jam. 6, and elsewhere 44 times. παρενοχλεῖν is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. ἐπιστρέφειν, Acts 11, Luke 7, Jam. v. 19, 20, rest 19 times; the phrase ἐπιστρ. ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν is a favourite and characteristic expression of the Author, who uses it ix. 35, xi. 21, xiv. 15, xxvi. 20, and Luke i. 16, and it does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament except in 1 Pet. ii. 25. *Verse* 20: ἐπιστέλλειν, xxi. 25, and Hebr. xiii. 22 only. ἀπέχειν xv. 29, Luke vi. 24, vii. 6, xv. 20, xxiv. 13,

1 Thess. iv. 3, v. 22, 1 Tim. iv. 3, 1 Pet. ii. 11, and elsewhere 7 times; in both passages of the Ep. to the Thess. it is used with ἀπό as here. ἀλίσγημα is not elsewhere found. εἴδωλον, vii. 41; 6 times by Paul, and elsewhere 3: it occurs very frequently in the Septuagint. πορνεία, xv. 29, xxi. 25; Paul 8, elsewhere 15 times. πνικτόν, xv. 29, xxi. 25, a technical word. αἷμα, Acts 12, Luke 11 times, rest frequently. γενεά, ii. 40, viii. 33, xiii. 36, xiv. 16; Luke 13 times, Matth. 13, Mk. 5, rest 5 times. ἀρχαῖος, xv. 7, xxi. 16; Luke ix. 8, 19, elsewhere 7 times. κατὰ πόλιν, xv. 36, xx. 23, xxiv. 12; Luke viii. 1, 4, xiii. 22, and elsewhere only in Tit. i. 5. κηρύσσειν, viii. 5, ix. 20, x. 37, 42, xix. 13, xx. 25, xxviii. 31; Luke 9, Paul 14, elsewhere 30 times. σάββατον, Acts 9, Luke 20, rest 35 times, the whole phrase ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος occurs again in the Acts, being put into the mouth of Paul xiii. 27, and ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ κατὰ πᾶν σάβ. being used by the writer in xviii. 4. συναγωγή, Acts 20; Luke 15, rest 22 times. ἀναγινώσκειν, viii. 28, 30 twice, 32, xiii. 27, xv. 31, xxiii. 34; Luke 3, and elsewhere 22 times. This analysis confirms the conclusion that the speech of James at the Council proceeds likewise from the pen of the general Author, and the incomprehensible liberality of the sentiments expressed, as well as the peculiarity of the quotation from Amos according to the Septuagint, thus receive at once their simple explanation. If we now compare the account of James' share in granting liberal conditions to Gentile Christians with the statements of Paul we arrive at the same result. It is in consequence of the arrival of "certain men from James" (τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου) that Peter through fear of them withdrew from communion

with the Gentiles. It will be remembered that the whole discussion is said to have arisen in Antioch originally from the judaistic teaching of certain men who came "from Judæa," who are disowned in the apostolic letter.[1] It is unfortunate, however, to say the least of it, that so many of those who systematically opposed the work of the Apostle Paul claimed to represent the views of James and the mother church.[2] The contradiction of the Author of the Acts, with his object of conciliation before him, has but small weight before the statements of Paul and the whole voice of tradition. At any rate, almost immediately after the so-called Apostolic Council, with its decree adopted mainly at the instigation of James, his emissaries caused the defection of Peter in Antioch and the rupture with Paul. It is generally admitted, in the face of the clear affirmation of Paul, that the men in question must probably or certainly have been actually sent by James.[3] It is obvious that, to justify the fear of so leading an apostle as Peter, not only must they have been thus deputed, but must have been influential men, re-

[1] Acts xv. 24.

[2] "Of the Judaizers who are denounced in St. Paul's Epistles this much is certain, that they exalted the authority of the Apostles of the Circumcision; and that, in some instances at least, as members of the mother Church, they had direct relations with James, the Lord's brother. But when we attempt to define those relations, we are lost in a maze of conjecture." *Lightfoot*, Ep. to the Gal., p. 353.

[3] *Alford*, Gk. Test., iii. p. 18; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 374, anm.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 220 f.; *Hemsen*, Der Ap. Paulus, 1830, p. 98; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol. 1860, p. 139 f.; Galaterbr., p. 153; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w., p. 357, 362; *Jowett*, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 244 f.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 382; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 111; cf. 353; *Meyer*, Gal., p. 93 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 222; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 473; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 284 f.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxvii.; St. Paul, p. 291 ff.; *Réville*, Essais, p. 16; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. K., p. 145; *Rückert*, Br. an die Gal., p. 87 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 118 f., 159, ii. p. 107; *Stap*, Origines, p. 77; *De Wette*, Br. an die Gal. p. 38; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 232 ff.

presenting authoritative and prevalent judaistic opinions. We shall not attempt to divine the object of their mission, but we may say that it is impossible to separate them from the judaistic teachers who urged circumcision upon the Galatian Christians and opposed the authority of the Apostle Paul. Not pursuing this further at present, however, it is obvious that the effect produced by these emissaries is quite incompatible with the narrative that, so short a time before, James and the Church of Jerusalem had unanimously promulgated conditions, under which the Gentile Christians were freely admitted into communion, and which fully justified Peter in eating with them. The incident at Antioch, as connected with James as well as with Peter, excludes the supposition that the account of the Council contained in the Acts can be considered historical.

The Apostolic letter embodying the decree of the Council now demands our attention. It seemed good to the Apostles and the elders with the whole Church to choose two leading men among the brethren, and to send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas, and they wrote by them (xv. 23):—"The Apostles and brethren which are elders unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, greeting. 24. Forasmuch as we heard that certain which went out from us troubled you with words, subverting your souls; to whom we gave no commandment, 25. it seemed good unto us, having become of one mind, to choose out and send men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, 26. men that have given up their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. 27. We have, therefore, sent Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by word of mouth. 28. For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary

things: 29. that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well. Fare ye well."[1] It is argued that the simplicity of this composition, its brevity, and the absence of hierarchical tendency, prove the authenticity and originality of the epistle. Nothing, however, could be more arbitrary than to assert that the Author of the Acts, composing a letter supposed to be written under the circumstances, would have written one different from this. We shall, on the contrary, see good reason for affirming that he actually did compose it, and that it bears the obvious impress of his style. Besides, Zeller[2] has pointed out that, in a document affirmed to be so removed from all calculation or object, verse 26 could hardly have found a place. The reference to "our beloved" Barnabas and Paul, as "men that have given up their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," is scarcely consistent with the primitive brevity and simplicity which are made the basis of such an argument. In the absence of better evidence, apologists grasp at extremely slight indications of authenticity, and of this nature seems to us the mark of genuineness which Bleek and others[3] consider

[1] 23. Οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Αντιόχειαν καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν χαίρειν. 24. ἐπειδὴ ἠκούσαμεν ὅτι τινὲς ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξελθόντες ἐτάραξαν ὑμᾶς λόγοις ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, οἷς οὐ διεστειλάμεθα, 25. ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν, ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρας πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς σὺν τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν Βαρνάβᾳ καὶ Παύλῳ, 26. ἀνθρώποις παραδεδωκόσιν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 27. ἀπεστάλκαμεν οὖν Ἰούδαν καὶ Σίλαν, καὶ αὐτοὺς διὰ λόγου ἀπαγγέλλοντας τὰ αὐτά. 28. ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν, μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος πλὴν τούτων τῶν ἐπάναγκες· 29. ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων καὶ αἵματος καὶ πνικτῶν καὶ πορνείας, ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εὖ πράξετε. ἔρρωσθε.

[2] Apostelgesch., 246 f.

[3] *Bleek*, Einl., p. 349; *Baumgarten*, Apg., p. 470 f.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V.

that they find in the fact, that the name of Barnabas is placed before that of Paul in this document. It is maintained that, from the 13th chapter, the author commences to give the precedence to Paul, but that, in reverting to the former order, the synodal letter gives evidence both of its antiquity and genuineness. If any weight could be attached to such an indication, it is unfortunate for this argument that the facts are not as stated, for the order "Barnabas and Paul" occurs at xiv. 12 and 14, and even in the very account of the Council at xv. 12. The two names are mentioned together in the Acts sixteen times, Barnabas being named first eight times (xi. 30, xii. 25, xiii. 1, 2, 7, xiv. 12, 14, xv. 12), and Paul as frequently (xiii. 43, 46, 50, xv. 2 twice, 22, 25, 35). Apologists like Lekebusch [1] and Oertel [2] reject Bleek's argument. In the greeting χαίρειν, with which the letter opens, and which, amongst the Epistles of the New Testament, is only found in that bearing the name of James (i. 1), an indication is found that the letter of the Council was written by James himself.[3] Before such an argument could avail, it would be necessary, though difficult, to prove the authenticity of the Epistle of James, but we need not enter upon such a question. χαίρειν is the ordinary Greek form of greeting in all epistles,[4] and the Author of Acts, who writes purer Greek than any

Isr., vi. p. 440, anm.; *Lange*, Das ap. Z., ii. p. 189; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 345 f.

[1] Die Apostelgesch., p. 316.

[2] Paulus in d. Apostelgesch., 1868, p. 227.

[3] *Baumgarten*, Apg., i. p. 470 f.; *Bengel*, Gnom. N. T., p. 577; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 349; Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 1037; *Fielmoser*, Einl., p. 487; *Kern*, Br. Jacobi, 1838, p. 106; *Schaff*, Gesch. d. ap. Kirche 2te Aufl., p. 260, anm. 1; *Stier*, Die Red. d. Ap., ii. p. 41. Cf. *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 173, anm. 1.

[4] Wetstein quotes Artemidorus (Oneir. iii. 44): ἴδιον πάσης πιστολῆς τὸ χαίρειν καὶ ἔρρωσο λέγειν. Ad Act. Apost. xv. 23.

other writer in our Canon, naturally adopts it. Not only does he do so here, however, but he makes use of the same χαίρειν in the letter of the chief captain Lysias (xxiii. 26),[1] which also evidently proceeds from his hand. Moreover, the word is used as a greeting in Luke i. 28, and not unfrequently elsewhere in the New Testament, as Matth. xxvi. 49, xxvii. 29, xxviii. 9, Mark xv. 18, John xix. 3, 2 John 10, 11. Lekebusch,[2] Meyer,[3] and Oertel[4] reject the argument, and we may add that if χαίρειν prove anything, it proves that the Author of Acts, who uses the word in the letter of Lysias, also wrote the synodal letter. In what language must we suppose that the Epistle was originally written? Oertel maintains an Aramaic original,[5] but the greater number of writers consider that the original language was Greek.[6] It cannot be denied that the composition, as it stands, contains many of the peculiarities of style of the author of Acts;[7] and these are, indeed, so marked that even apologists like Lekebusch and Oertel, whilst maintaining the substantial authenticity of the Epistle, admit that at least its actual form must be ascribed to the general Author. The originality of the form being abandoned, it is difficult to perceive any ground for asserting the originality and genuineness of

[1] This letter terminates, v. 30, with the usual ἔρρωσο, according to the Cod. Sinaiticus, E, G, and others; A and B omit it.

[2] Apostelg., p. 316. [3] Apostelg., p. 345.

[4] Paul. in d. Apg., p. 227; comp. *Reiche*, Comm. in Ep. Jac. 1833, p. 1.

[5] *Ib.*, p. 227 f, Cf. *Grotius*, Annot. in N. T. ad Act. Ap., xv. 23, who takes χαίρειν to be the rendering of the Hebrew salutation of Peace.

[6] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 169; *Bleek*, Einl. p. 349; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 345; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 217 f. Cf. *Baumgarten*, Apg., p. 470 ff.

[7] *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 253 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 444; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw. viii. p. 340 f.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 116, 315; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 199; *Oertel*, Paulus, p. 227; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 236 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., i. p. 127, anm. 1; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 246 ff.

the substance. That assertion rests solely upon a vague traditional confidence in the author of Acts, which is shown to be without any solid foundation. The form of this Epistle clearly professes to be as genuine as the substance, and if the original language was Greek, there is absolutely no reason why the original letter should have been altered. The similarity of the construction to that of the prologue to the third Gospel, in which the personal style of the writer may be supposed to have been most unreservedly shown, has long been admitted :—

Luke i.	Acts xv.
1. ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι . . .	24. ἐπειδὴ ἠκούσαμεν ὅτι τινὲς ἐτάραξαν . . .
3. ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ, παρηκολουθηκότι πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς, καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι.	25. ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν, ἄνδρας πέμψαι.

A more detailed linguistic examination of the Epistle, however, confirms the conclusion already stated. *Verse* 23: διὰ χειρός, ii. 23, v. 12, vii. 25, xi. 30, xiv. 3, xix. 11, 26, and the expression is only met with elsewhere in Mark vi. 2; the phrase γράψαντες δ. χ. αὐτῶν finds a parallel in xi. 30, ἀποστείλαντες δ. χ. Βαρνάβα, κ. τ. λ. The characteristic expression κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, κ. τ. λ., is repeated, xi. 1, xvi. 7, xxvii. 2, 5, 7. *Verse* 24: ἐπειδή, xiii. 46, xiv. 12, Luke vii. 1, xi. 6, cf. i. 1; Paul 5, rest only 2 times. ταράσσειν, xvii. 8, 13, Luke i. 12, xxiv. 38, elsewhere thirteen times. ἀνασκευάζειν is not found elsewhere, but the preference of our writer for compounds of ἀνά, διά, and ἐπί is marked, and of these consists a large proportion of his ἅπαξ λεγόμενα. Ψυχή, Acts 15, Luke 14 times, and frequently elsewhere; the phrase ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχάς, κ. τ. λ., may be compared with xiv. 22, ἐπιστηρίζοντες τὰς ψυχάς, κ. τ. λ., cf. xiv. 2. διαστέλλεσθαι

not elsewhere found in Acts, but it occurs Matth. xvi. 20, Mark v. 43, vii. 36 twice, viii. 15, ix. 9, and Heb. xii. 20, *Verse* 25: δοκεῖν, Acts 8, Luke 11, Paul 17 times, elsewhere frequently. ὁμοθυμαδόν, i. 14, ii. 1, 46, iv. 24, v. 12, xii. 57, viii. 6, xii. 20, xviii. 12, xix. 29; so that this word, not in very common use even in general Greek literature, occurs 10 times elsewhere in the Acts, but, except in Rom. xv. 6, is not employed by any other New Testament writer. ἐκλέγεσθαι, i. 2, 24, vi. 5, xiii. 17, xv. 7, 22, Luke vi. 13, x. 42, xiv. 7, and elsewhere 11 times. πέμπειν, Acts 11, Luke 10 times, elsewhere common. ἀγαπητός is not elsewhere used in Acts, but is found in Luke iii. 22, ix. 35, xx. 13, Paul 13 times, and is common elsewhere. *Verse* 26: παραδιδόναι, Acts 13, Luke 17 times, and common elsewhere. ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου, xxi. 13, v. 41, ix. 16, Rom. i. 5, 3 John 7. *Verse* 27: ἀποστελλειν, Acts 25, Luke 26 times, elsewhere very frequently. διὰ λόγου, xv. 32. ἀπαγγέλλειν, Acts 14, Luke 11, rest 21 times. τὰ αὐτά, Luke vi. 23, 26; τὸ αὐτό, Acts i. 15, ii. 1, 44, iii. 1, iv. 26, xiv. 1; Luke vi. 33, xvii. 35. *Verse* 28: μηδέν, Acts 12, Luke 4, Paul 6, elsewhere 13 times; the same expression, μηδὲν πλέον . . . is also found in Luke iii. 13. ἐπιτιθέναι, Acts 13, Luke 6, elsewhere 21 times. βάρος is not elsewhere met with in Acts, but occurs Matt. xx. 12, 2 Cor. iv. 17, Gal. vi. 2, 1 Thes. ii. 6, Apoc. ii. 24. πλήν, viii. 1, xx. 23, xxvii. 22, Luke 15, elsewhere 13 times. ἐπάναγκες is not elsewhere found in the New Testament. *Verse* 29: ἀπέχειν, xv. 20, Luke vi. 24, vii. 6, xv. 20, xxiv. 13, elsewhere 12 times. εἰδωλόθυτον, xxi. 25, 1 Cor. viii. 1, 4, 7, 10, x. 19, 28, Apoc. ii. 14, 20. διατηρεῖν occurs only in Luke ii. 51. πράσσειν, Acts 12, Luke 6, Paul 15, elsewhere 5 only. ῥώννυσθαι, this

usual Greek formula for the ending of a letter, ἔρρωσθε, is nowhere else used in the New Testament, except at the close of the letter of Lysias, xxiii. 30.

Turning now from the letter to the spirit of this decree, we must endeavour to form some idea of its purport and bearing. The first point which should be made clear is, that the question raised before the Council solely affected the Gentile Converts, and that the conditions contained in the decree were imposed upon that branch of the Church alone. No change whatever in the position of Jewish Christians was contemplated; they were left as before, subject to the Mosaic law.[1] This is very apparent in the reference which is made long after to the decree, Ch. xxi. 20 ff, 25, when the desire is expressed to Paul by James, who proposed the decree, and the elders of Jerusalem, that he should prove to the many thousands of believing Jews all zealous of the law, that he did not teach the Jews who were among the Gentiles apostasy from Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. Paul, who, in the Acts, is likewise represented as circumcising with his own hand, after the decision of the Council had been adopted, Timothy the son of a Greek, whose mother was a Jewess, consents to give the Jews of Jerusalem the required proof. We have already shown at the commencement of this section, that

[1] *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 217; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1858, p. 95; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 408 ff.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 167 f.; *Niedner*, Gesch. chr. Kirche, p. 103; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 227 f., 236 f.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 281 f., 284 f.; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 472 f.; *Renan*, St. Paul, p. 87; *Reuss*, Rev. de Théol., 1859, iii. p. 65 ff., 83 f.; Gesch. N. T., p. 56; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. K., p. 129 ff.; *Schliemann*, Clementinen, p. 373 ff., anm.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 124; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 192 f.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 571; *Wieseler*, Br. an die Gal., p. 144, anm. 1; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 235 f., 238 f. Cf. *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 125 f., 294 f.; *Oertel*, Paulus, p. 250 f.

nothing was further from the minds of the Jewish Christians than the supposition that the obligation to observe the Mosaic law was weakened by the adoption of Christianity; and the representation in the Acts is certainly so far correct, that it does not pretend that Jewish Christians either desired or sanctioned any relaxation of Mosaic observances on the part of believing Jews. This cannot be too distinctly remembered in considering the history of primitive Christianity. The initiatory rite was essential to full participation in the Covenant. It was left for Paul to preach the abrogation of the law and the abandonment of circumcision. If the speech of Peter seems to suggest the abrogation of the law even for Jews, it is only in a way which shows that the author had no clear historical fact to relate, and merely desired to ascribe vaguely and indefinitely Pauline sentiments to the Apostle of the circumcision. No remark whatever is made upon these strangely liberal expressions of Peter, and neither the proposition of James nor the speech in which he makes it takes the slightest notice of them. The conduct of Peter at Antioch and the influence exercised by James through his emissaries restore us to historical ground. Whether the author intended to represent that the object of the conditions of the decree was to admit the Gentile Christians to full communion with the Jewish, or merely to the subordinate position of Proselytes of the Gate, is uncertain, but it is not necessary to discuss the point. There is not the slightest external evidence that such a decree ever existed, and the more closely the details are examined the more evident does it become that it has no historical consistency. How, and upon what principle, were these singular conditions selected? Their heterogeneous character is at once apparent, but not so the

reason for a combination which is neither limited to Jewish customs nor sufficiently representative of moral duties. It has been argued, on the one hand, that the prohibitions of the apostolic decree are simply those, reduced to a necessary minimum, which were enforced in the case of heathen converts to Judaism who did not join themselves fully to the people of the Covenant by submitting to circumcision, but were admitted to imperfect communion as Proselytes of the Gate.[1] The conditions named, however, do not fully represent the rules framed for such cases, and many critics consider that the conditions imposed, although they may have been influenced by the Noachian prescriptions, were rather moral duties which it was, from special circumstances, thought expedient to specify.[2] We shall presently refer to some of these conditions, but bearing in mind the views which were dominant amongst primitive Christians, and more especially, as is obvious, amongst the Christians of Jerusalem where this decree is supposed to have been unanimously adopted, bearing in mind the teaching which is said to have led to the Council, the episode at Antioch, and the systematic judaistic opposition which retarded the work of Paul and subsequently affected his reputation, it may be instructive

[1] *Ebrard*, zu Olsh. Apg., p. 215 f.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 204 f.; *Niedner*, K. G., p. 103; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 230; *Reuss*, Rev. de Théol., 1859, iii. p. 85 f.; Gesch. N. T., p. 56; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. K., p. 129 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 109 f.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 188 ff.; *Wieseler*, Br. an d. Gal., p. 147 ff. Cf. *Bleek*, Einl., p. 372; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 167, anm. 3, p. 171, anm. 1; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 570 f.

[2] *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1858, p. 75 f.; 1860, p. 128 ff., 164 f.; *Hofmann*, Die heil. Schr. N. T., i. p. 133 f.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 311 ff.; *Lightfoot*, Works, iii. p. 220 ff, viii. p. 477 ff.; *J. B. Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 295; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 338 ff.; *Schliemann*, Clementinen, p. 388, anm. 23; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 73 f., anm.; *Schoettgen*, Horæ Hebr., p. 461 ff.

to point out not only the vagueness which exists as to the position which it was intended that the Gentiles should acquire, as the effect of this decree, but also its singular and total inefficiency. An apologetic writer, having of course in his mind the fact that there is no trace of the operation of the decree, speaks of its conditions as follows: "The miscellaneous character of these prohibitions showed that, taken as a whole, they had no binding force independently of the circumstances which dictated them. They were a temporary expedient framed to meet a temporary emergency. Their object was the avoidance of offence in mixed communities of Jew and Gentile converts. Beyond this recognised aim and general understanding implied therein, the limits of their application were not defined."[1] In fact the immunity granted to the Gentiles was thus practically almost unconditional. It is obvious, however, that every consideration which represents the decree as more completely emancipating Gentile Christians from Mosaic obligations, and admitting them into free communion with believers amongst the Jews, places it in more emphatic contradiction to historical facts and the statements of the Apostle Paul. The unanimous adoption of such a measure in Jerusalem, on the one hand, and, on the other, the episode at Antioch, the fear of Peter, the silence of Paul, and the attitude of James, become perfectly inconceivable. If on the contrary the conditions were seriously imposed and really meant anything, a number of difficulties spring up of which we shall presently speak. That the prohibitions, in the opinion of the Author of the Acts, constituted a positive and binding obligation can scarcely be doubted by anyone who considers the terms in which they are laid down. If they

[1] *Lightfoot*, Ep. to the Gal. p. 296.

are represented as a concession they are nevertheless recognised as a "burden," and they are distinctly stated to be the obligations which "it seemed good to the Holy Spirit" as well as to the Council to impose. The qualification, that the restrictive clauses had no binding force "independently of the circumstances which dictated them," in so far as it has any meaning beyond the unnecessary declaration that the decree was only applicable to the class for whom it was framed, seems to be inadmissible. The circumstance which dictated the decree was the counter-teaching of Jewish Christians, that it was necessary that the Gentile converts should be circumcised and keep the law of Moses. The restrictive clauses are simply represented as those which it was deemed right to impose; and, as they are stated without qualification, it is holding the decision of the "Holy Spirit" and of the Church somewhat cheap to treat them as mere local and temporary expedients. This is evidently not the view of the Author of the Acts. Would it have been the view of anyone else if it were not that, so far as any external trace of the decree is concerned, it is an absolute myth? The prevalence of practices to which the four prohibitions point is quite sufficiently attested to show that, little as there is any ground for considering that such a decree was framed in such a manner, the restrictive clauses are put forth as necessary and permanently binding. The very doubt which exists as to whether the prohibitions were not intended to represent the conditions imposed on Proselytes of the Gate shows their close analogy to them, and it cannot be reasonably asserted that the early Christians regarded those conditions either as obsolete or indifferent. The decree is clearly intended to set forth the terms upon which Gentile Christians were

to be admitted into communion, and undoubtedly is to be taken as applicable not merely to a few districts, but to the Gentiles in general.

The account which Paul gives of his visit not only ignores any such decree, but excludes it. In the first place, taking into account the Apostle's character and the spirit of his Epistle, it is impossible to suppose that Paul had any intention of submitting, as to higher authority, the Gospel which he preached, for the judgment of the elder Apostles and of the Church of Jerusalem.[1] Nothing short of this is involved in the account in the Acts, and in the form of the decree which promulgates, in an authoritative manner, restrictive clauses which "seemed good to the Holy Spirit" and to the Council. The temper of the man is well shown in Paul's indignant letter to the Galatians. He receives his Gospel, not from men, but by direct revelation from Jesus Christ, and, so far is he from submission of the kind implied, that he says: "But even though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any Gospel other than that which we preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so say I now again: If any man preach any Gospel to you other than that ye received, let him be accursed."[2] That the Apostle here refers to his own peculiar teaching, and does so in contradistinction to the Gospel preached by the Judaizers, is evident from the preceding words: "I marvel that ye are so soon removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different Gospel; which is not another, only there are

[1] *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 217 f.: *Ewald*, Sendschr. des Ap. Paulus 1857, p. 71; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th. 1858, p. 77 ff.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 196, 199 f.; *Reuss*, Rev. de Théol., 1858, ii. p. 334; Théol. Chr., i. p. 311 f.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 183 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 189 f., 196.

[2] Gal. i. 8, 9.

some that trouble you, and desire to pervert the Gospel of Christ."[1] Passing from this, however, to the restrictive clauses in general, how is it possible that Paul could state, as the result of his visit, that the "pillar" Apostles "communicated nothing" after hearing his Gospel, if the four conditions of this decree had thus been authoritatively "communicated"? On the contrary, Paul distinctly adds that, in acknowledging his mission, but one condition had been attached: "Only that we should remember the poor; which very thing I also was forward to do."[2] As one condition is here mentioned, why not the others, had any been actually imposed? It is argued that the remembrance of the poor of Jerusalem which is thus inculcated was a recommendation personally made to Paul and Barnabas, but it is clear that the Apostle's words refer to the result of his communication of his Gospel, and to the understanding under which his mission to the Gentiles was tolerated. We have already pointed out how extraordinary it is that such a decision of the Council should not have been referred to in describing his visit, and the more we go into details the more striking and inexplicable, except in one way, is such silence. In relating the struggle regarding the circumcision of Titus, for instance, and stating that he did not yield, no, not for an hour, to the demands made on the subject, is it conceivable that, if the exemption of all Gentile Christians from the initiatory rite had been unanimously conceded, Paul would not have added to his

[1] Gal. i. 6, 7.

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 151 ff.; K. G., i. p. 51; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 217; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1858, p. 81 f., 1860, p. 131 f.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 66; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. Lex., i. p. 199 f.; *Pfleiderer*, Paulinismus, p. 503; *Schrader*, Der Ap. P., ii. p. 305; v. p. 271 f., 546; *Stap*, Origines, p. 191 f.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 192 f.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 570 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 235 ff.

statement about Titus, that not only he himself had not been compelled to give way in this instance, but that his representations had even convinced those who had been Apostles before him, and secured the unanimous adoption of his own views on the point? The whole of this Epistle is a vehement and intensely earnest denunciation of those Judaizers who were pressing the necessity of the initiatory rite upon the Galatian converts.[1] Is it possible that the Apostle could have left totally unmentioned the fact that the Apostles and the very Church of Jerusalem had actually declared circumcision to be unnecessary? It would not have accorded with Paul's character, it is said, to have appealed to the authority of the elder Apostles or of the Church in a matter in which his own apostolic authority and teaching were in question. In that case, how can it be supposed that he ever went at all up to Jerusalem to the Apostles and elders about this question? If he was not too proud to lay aside his apostolic dignity, and, representing the Christians of Antioch, to submit the case to the Council at Jerusalem, and subsequently to deliver its decree to various communities, is it consistent with reason or common sense to assert that he was too proud to recall the decision of that Council to the Christians of Galatia? It must, we think, be obvious that, if such an explanation of Paul's total silence as to the decree be at all valid, it is absolutely fatal to the account of Paul's visit in the Acts. This reasoning is not confined to the Epistle to the Galatians, but, as Paley points out, applies to the other Epistles of Paul, in all

[1] "Turning from Antioch to Galatia, we meet with Judaic teachers who urged circumcision on the Gentile converts, and, as the best means of weakening the authority of St. Paul, asserted for the Apostles of the Circumcision the exclusive right of dictating to the Church." *Lightfoot*, Ep. to the Gal. p. 353.

of which the same silence is preserved. Moreover, the apologetic explanation altogether fails upon other grounds. Without appealing to the decree as an authority, we must feel sure that the Apostle would at least have made use of it as a logical refutation of his adversaries. The man who did not hesitate to attack Peter openly for inconsistency, and charge him with hypocrisy, would not have hesitated to cite the decree as evidence, and still less to fling it in the faces of those Judaizers who, so short a time after that decree is supposed to have been promulgated, preached the necessity of circumcision and Mosaic observances in direct opposition to its terms, whilst claiming to represent the views of the very Apostles and Church which had framed it. Paul, who never denies the validity of their claim, would most certainly have taunted them with gross inconsistency and retorted that the Church of Jerusalem, the Apostles, and the Judaizers who now troubled him and preached circumcision and the Mosaic law had, four or five years previously, declared as the deliberate decision of the Holy Spirit and the Council, that they were no longer binding on the Gentile converts. By such a reference "the discussion would have been foreclosed." None of the reasons which are suggested to explain the undeniable fact that there is no mention of the decree can really bear examination, and that fact remains supported by a great many powerful considerations, leading to the very simple explanation which reconciles all difficulties, that the narrative of the Acts is not authentic.

We arrive at the very same results when we examine the Apostle's references to the practices which the conditions of the decree were intended to control. Instead of recognising the authority of the decree, or enforcing its

prescriptions, he does not even allow us to infer its existence, and he teaches disregard at least of some of its restrictions. The decree enjoins the Gentile Christians to abstain from meats offered to idols. Paul tells the Corinthians to eat whatever meat is sold in the shambles without asking questions for conscience sake, for an idol is nothing in the world, "neither if we eat are we the better, nor if we eat not are we the worse."[1] It is not conceivable that the Apostle could so completely have ignored the prohibition of the decree if he had actually submitted the question to the Apostles, and himself so distinctly acquiesced in their decision as to distribute the document amongst the various communities whom he subsequently visited. To argue that the decree was only intended to have force in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia, to which, as the locality in which the difficulty had arisen which had originally led to the Council, the decree was, in the first instance, addressed, is highly arbitrary; but, when proceeding further, apologists[2] draw a distinction between those churches "which had already been founded, and which had felt the pressure of Jewish prejudice (Acts xvi. 4)," and "brotherhoods afterwards formed and lying beyond the reach of such influences," as a reason why no notice of the decree is taken in the case of the Corinthians and Romans, the special pleading ignores very palpable facts. "Jewish prejudices" are represented in the Acts of the Apostles themselves as being more than usually strong in Corinth. There was a Jewish synagogue there, augmented probably by the Jews expelled from Rome under Claudius,[3] and their violence against

[1] Cor. viii. 4 ff., x. 25 ff.
[2] *Lightfoot*, St. Paul's Ep. to the Gal., p. 126 f.
[3] Acts xviii. 2.

Paul finally obliged him to leave the place.[1] Living in the midst of an idolatrous city, and much exposed to the temptations of sacrificial feasts, we might naturally expect excessive rigour against participation, on the one hand, and perhaps too great indifference, on the other; and this we actually find to have been the case. It is in consequence of questions respecting meats offered to idols that Paul writes to the Corinthians, and whilst treating the matter in itself as one of perfect indifference, merely inculcates consideration for weak consciences.[2] It is clear that there was a prejudice against the practice; it is clear that strong Jewish prejudices existed in the Jewish colony at Corinth, and wherever there were Jews the eating of meats offered to idols was an abomination. The sin of Israel at Baalpeor[3] lived in the memory of the people, and abstinence from such pollution[4] was considered a duty. If the existence of such "Jewish prejudices" was a reason for publishing the decree, we have, in fact, more definite evidence of them in Corinth than we have in Antioch, for, apart from this specific mention of the subject of eating sacrificial meats, the two apostolic letters abundantly show the existence and activity of Judaistic parties there, which opposed the work of Paul, and desired to force Mosaic observances upon his converts. It is impossible to admit that, supposing such a decree to have been promulgated as the mind of the Holy Spirit, there could be any reason why it should have been unknown at Corinth so short a time after it was adopted. When, therefore, we find the Apostle not only ignoring it, but actually declaring that to be a matter of indifference, abstinence from which it had just seemed

[1] xviii. 6, 12 ff.
[2] 1 Cor. viii. 1—13, x. 23 ff.
[3] Numb. xxv. 2 f.; Ps. cvi. 28.
[4] Dan. i. 8 f.

good to the Holy Spirit to enjoin, the only reasonable conclusion is that Paul himself was totally ignorant of the existence of any decree containing such a prohibition. There is much difference of opinion as to the nature of the πορνεία referred to in the decree, and we need not discuss it; but in all the Apostle's homilies upon the subject there is the same total absence of all allusion to the decision of the Council. Nowhere can any practical result from the operation of the decree be pointed out, nor any trace even of its existence.[1] The assertions and conjectures, by which those who maintain the authenticity of the narrative in the Acts seek to explain the extraordinary absence of all external evidence of the decree, labour under the disadvantage of all attempts to account for the total failure of effects from a supposed cause, the existence of which is in reality only assumed. It is customary to reply to the objection that there is no mention of the decree in the Epistles of Paul or in any other contemporary writing, that this is a mere argument *a silentio*. Is it not, however, difficult to imagine any other argument, from contemporary sources, regarding what is affirmed to have had no existence, than that from silence? Do apologists absolutely demand that, with prophetic anticipation of future controversies, the Apostle Paul should obligingly have left on record that there actually was no Council such as a writer would subsequently describe, and that the decree which he

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 150 ff.; *Bleek*, Einl., p. 372 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 216 ff., 222; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1858, p. 82 ff.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 69 ff.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 199 f.; *Nicolas*, Études N. T., p. 254 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 239 f.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxvii. f.; *Scholten*, Het paul. Ev., p. 450 f.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 192 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 234 ff. Cf. *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 296 f..

would put forward as the result of that Council must not be accepted as genuine? It is natural to expect that, when writing of the very visit in question, and dealing with subjects and discussions in which, whether in the shape of historical allusion, appeal to authority, taunt for inconsistency, or assertion of his own influence, some allusion to the decree would have been highly appropriate, if not necessary, the Apostle Paul should at least have given some hint of its existence. His not doing so constitutes strong presumptive evidence against the authenticity of the decree, and all the more so as no more positive evidence than silence could possibly be forthcoming of the non-existence of that which never existed. The supposed decree of the Council of Jerusalem cannot on any ground be accepted as a historical fact.[1]

We may now return to such further consideration of the statements of the Epistle as may seem necessary for the object of our inquiry. No mention is made by the Apostle of any official mission on the subject of circumcision, and the discussion of that question arises in a merely incidental manner from the presence of Titus, an uncircumcised Gentile Christian. There has been much discussion as to whether Titus actually was circumcised or not, and there

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 150 ff.; Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 474 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 217 ff., 252 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1858, p. 81 ff., 600; 1860, p. 128 ff.; Galaterbr., p. 58 f., 151 f.; Der Kanon, p. 205 ff.; *Krenkel*, Paulus, p. 70 ff.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 199 ff., 204 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 216 ff., 221, 229 f., 236 ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 503; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxvi. ff.; St. Paul, p. 92, note 2; *Scholten*, Het paul. Ev., p. 450 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, ii. p. 305; v. p. 545 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 117 ff.; ii. p. 87 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 191 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 192 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 234 ff. Cf. *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 340 f.

can be little doubt that the omission of the negative οἷς οὐδέ from Gal. ii. 5, has been in some cases influenced by the desire to bring the Apostle's conduct upon this occasion into harmony with the account, in Acts xvi. 3, of his circumcising Timothy.[1] We shall not require to enter into any controversy on the point, for the great majority of critics are agreed that the Apostle intended to say that Titus was not circumcised, although the contrary is affirmed by a few writers.[2] It is obvious from the whole of the Apostle's narrative that great pressure was exerted to induce Titus to submit, and that Paul, if he did not yield even for an hour the required subjection, had a long and severe struggle to maintain his position. Even when relating the circumstances in his letter to the Galatians, the recollection of his contest profoundly stirs the Apostle's indignation; his utterance becomes vehement, but cannot keep pace with his impetuous thoughts, and the result is a narrative in broken and abrupt sentences whose very incompleteness is eloquent, and betrays the irritation which has not even yet entirely subsided. How does this accord with the whole tone of the account in the Acts? It is customary with apologists to insert so much between the lines of that narrative, partly from imagination and partly from the statements of the Epistle, that they almost convince themselves and others that such additions are actually suggested by the Author of the Acts himself. If we take the account of the Acts, however, without such transmutations, it is certain that not only is there not the slightest indication of any struggle regarding the circum-

[1] *Alford*, Gk. Test., iii. p. 14; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 165, anm. 1; *Thiersch*, Die K. im ap. Z., p. 137; *Usteri*, Br. an die Gal. p. 46.

[2] *Reiche*, Comm. crit. in N. T., 1859, ii. p. 14 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxv. f.; St. Paul, p. 87 ff.; *Rückert*, Br. an d. Gal. p. 73 f.

cision of Titus, "in which St. Paul maintained at one time almost single-handed the cause of Gentile freedom,"[1] but no suggestion that there had ever been any hesitation on the part of the leading Apostles and the mass of the Church regarding the point at issue. The impression given by the Author of the Acts is undeniably one of unbroken and undisturbed harmony: of a council in which the elder Apostles were of one mind with Paul, and warmly agreed with him that the Gentiles should be delivered from the yoke of the Mosaic law and from the necessity of undergoing the initiatory rite. What is there in such an account to justify in any degree the irritation displayed by Paul at the mere recollection of this visit, or to merit the ironical terms with which he speaks of the "pillar" Apostles? We may, however, now consider the part which the Apostles must have taken in the dispute regarding the circumcision of Titus. Is it possible to suppose that if the circumcision of Paul's follower had only been demanded by certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed, unsupported by the rest, there could ever have been any considerable struggle on the point? Is it possible, further, to suppose that if Paul had received the cordial support of James and the leading Apostles in his refusal to concede the circumcision of Titus, such a contest could have been more than momentary and trifling? Is it possible that the Apostle Paul could have spoken of "certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed" in such terms as: "to whom we yielded by the submission (εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ) no not for an hour?"[2] or that he could have used this expression if those who pressed the demand upon him had not been in a position of authority, which naturally suggested a subjection which

[1] *Lightfoot*, Ib. p. 106.

[2] Gal. ii. 5.

Paul upon this occasion persistently refused? It is not possible. Of course many writers who seek to reconcile the two narratives, and some of whom substitute for the plain statements of the Acts and of the Apostle, an account which is not consistent with either, suppose that the demand for the circumcision of Titus proceeded solely from the "false brethren,"[1] although some of them suppose that at least these false brethren may have thought they had reason to hope for the support of the elder Apostles.[2] It is almost too clear for dispute, however, that the desire that Titus should be circumcised was shared or pressed by the elder Apostles.[3] According to the showing of the Acts, nothing could be more natural than the fact that James and the elders of Jerusalem who, so long after (xxi. 20 ff.), advised Paul to prove his continued observance of the law and that he did not teach the Jews to abandon circumcision, should on this occasion have pressed him to circumcise Titus. The conduct of Peter at Antioch, and the constant opposition which Paul met with from emissaries

[1] *Bleek*, Einl., p. 372; *Ewald*, Sendschr. Ap. Paulus, 1857, p. 71; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 403 ff.; *Meyer*, Gal., p. 56, 69 ff.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 164, anm. 2; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 460 f.; *Reuss*, Théol. Chr., i. p. 315 f.; Rev. de Théol. 1859, iii. p. 68 f.; *Ritschl*, Enst. altk. K., p. 128, anm. 1; *Weiseler*, Chron. ap. Z., p. 192 f.; Br. an d. Gal., p. 106 ff. Cf. *Ellicott*, Galatians, p. 25 f.; *Alford*, Gk. Test., iii. p. 13.

[2] *Wieseler* (Chron. ap. Zeit., p. 194) conjectures the meaning of Paul to be that, but for the false brethren, he would actually have circumcised Titus, and thus have been consistent with the principles which he maintained by the circumcision of Timothy, xvi. 3.

[3] *Baur*, K. G.. i. p. 49 f.; Paulus, i. p. 137 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Galaterbr., p. 56 f.; Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1858, p. 78 ff., 317 ff.; Einl., p. 228 f., 420 f.; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w., p. 272 ff.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 105 f.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 196 f., 202; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 279 f.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 72 f. Cf. *Jowett*, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 241, 331.

of James and of the Apostles of the Circumcision upon the very point of Gentile circumcision, all support the inevitable conclusion, that the pressure upon Paul in the matter of Titus was not only not resisted by the Apostles, but proceeded in no small degree from them.

This is further shown by the remainder of Paul's account of his visit and by the tone of his remarks regarding the principal Apostles, as well as by the historical data which we possess of his subsequent career. We need not repeat that the representation in the Acts both of the Council and of the whole intercourse between Paul and the Apostles is one of "unbroken unity." [1] The struggle about Titus and the quarrel with Peter at Antioch are altogether omitted, and the Apostolic letter speaks merely of "our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have given up their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." [2] The language of Paul is not so pacific and complimentary. Immediately after his statement that he had "yielded by the submission, no, not for an hour," Paul continues: "But from those who seemed to be something (ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι)—whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth not man's person;—for to me those who seemed (οἱ δοκοῦντες) (to be something) communicated nothing, but, on the contrary, &c. &c., and when they knew the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars (οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι), gave to me and Barnabas right hands of fellowship that we (should go) unto the Gentiles," &c. &c.[3] The tone and language of this passage are certainly depre-

[1] *Jowett*, The Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 330.
[2] Acts xv. 25 f.
[3] Gal. ii. 6, 9.

ciatory of the elder Apostles,[1] and, indeed, it is difficult to understand how any one could fail to perceive and admit the fact. It is argued by some who recognise the irony of the term οἱ δοκοῦντες applied to the Apostles, that the disparagement which is so transparent in the form οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναί τι, "those who seemed to be something," is softened again in the new turn which is given to it in ver. 9, οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι, "those who seemed to be pillars," in which, it is said, "the Apostle expresses the real greatness and high authority of the twelve in their separate field of labour."[2] It seems to us that this interpretation cannot be sustained Paul is ringing the changes on οἱ δοκοῦντες, and contrasting with the position they assumed and the estimation in which they were held, his own experience of them, and their inability to add anything to him. "Those who seemed to be something," he commences, but immediately interrupts himself, after having thus indicated the persons whom he meant, with the more direct protest of irritated independence:—"whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth not man's person." These δοκοῦντες communicated nothing to him, but, on the contrary, when they knew the grace given to him, "those who seemed to be pillars" gave him hands of fellowship, but nothing more, and they went their different ways, he to the Gentiles and they to the circumcision. If the ex-

[1] *Blom*, Theol. Tijdschrift, 1870, p. 466; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 218, 220; *Hausrath*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 192; Der Ap. Paulus, p. 257; *H. Lang*, Rel. Charaktere, i. 1862, p. 69 f.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 197; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 217; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxvi; *Reuss*, Rev. de Théol., 1859, iii. p. 90 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 120 f., 157 f.; ii. p. 109; *Stap*, Origines, p. 94; *Strauss*, Das Leben Jesu, p. 76. Cf. *Jowett*, The Eps. of St Paul, i. p. 330 f.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 107, 335.

[2] *Jowett*, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 331.

pression: οἱ δοκ. στῦλοι εἶναι be true, as well as ironically used, it cannot be construed into a declaration of respect, but forms part of a passage whose tone throughout is proudly depreciatory. This is followed by such words as "hypocrisy" (ὑπόκρισις) and "condemned" (κατεγνωσμένος) applied to the conduct of Peter at Antioch, as well as the mention of the emissaries of James as the cause of that dispute, which add meaning to the irony. This is not, however, the only occasion on which Paul betrays a certain bitterness against the elder Apostles. In his second letter to the Corinthians, xi. 5, he says, "For I reckon that I am not a whit behind the over much Apostles" (τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων), and again, xii. 11, "For in nothing was I behind the over much Apostles" (τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων); and the whole of the vehement passage in which these references are set shows the intensity of the feeling which called them forth. To say that the expressions in the Galatian Epistle and here are "depreciatory, not indeed of the twelve themselves, but of the extravagant and exclusive claims set up for them by the Judaizers,"[1] is an extremely arbitrary distinction. They are directly applied to the Apostles, and οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναί τι cannot be taken as irony against those who over estimated them, but against the δοκοῦντες themselves. Paul's blows generally go straight to their mark. Meyer argues that the designation of the Apostles as οἱ δοκοῦντες is purely historical, and cannot be taken as ironical, inasmuch as it would be inconsistent to suppose that Paul could adopt a depreciatory tone when he is relating his recognition as a colleague by the elder Apostles;[2] and others consider that

[1] *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p 107.

[2] Kr. Ex. H'buch üb. d. Br. an die Gal., 63 f.

ver. 8, 9, 10 contain evidence of mutual respect and recognition between Paul and the twelve. Even if this were so, it could not do away with the actual irony of the expressions; but do the facts support such a statement? We have seen that, in spite of the picture of unbroken unity drawn by the Author of the Acts, and the liberal sentiments regarding the Gentiles which he puts into the mouth of Peter and of James, Paul had a severe and protracted struggle to undergo in order to avoid circumcising Titus. We have already stated the grounds upon which it seems certain that the pressure upon that occasion came as well from the elder Apostles as the "false brethren," and critics who do not go so far as to make this positive affirmation, at least recognise the negative, and therefore to a large extent compliant, attitude which the Apostles must have held. It is after narrating some of the particulars of this struggle that Paul uses the terms of depreciation which we have been discussing; and having added, "for to me those who seemed (to be something) communicated nothing," he says, "*but, on the contrary*, when they saw that I have been entrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter with that of the circumcision (for he that wrought for Peter unto the Apostleship of the circumcision, wrought also for me unto the Gentiles); and when they knew the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas right hands of fellowship, that we (should go) unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision: only that we should remember the poor; which very thing I also was forward to do." It will be observed that, after saying they "communicated nothing" to him, the Apostle adds, in opposition, "but, on the

contrary" (ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον). In what does this opposition consist? Apparently in this, that, instead of strengthening the hands of Paul, they left him to labour alone. They said: "Take your own course; preach the Gospel of the uncircumcision to Gentiles, and we will preach the Gospel of the circumcision to Jews."[1] In fact, when Paul returned to Jerusalem for the second time after fourteen years, he found the elder Apostles not one whit advanced towards his own universalism; they retained their former Jewish prejudices, and remained as before Apostles of the circumcision.[2] Notwithstanding the strong Pauline sentiments put into his mouth by the Author of the Acts, and his claim to have been so long before selected by God that by his mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe, Paul singles out Peter as specially entrusted with the Gospel of the circumcision; and, in the end, after Paul has exerted all his influence, Peter and the rest remain unmoved, and allow Paul to go to the Gentiles, while they confine their ministry as before to the Jews. The success of Paul's work amongst the heathen was too palpable a fact to be ignored, but there is no reason to believe that the conversion of the Gentiles, upon his terms, was more than tolerated at that time, or the Gentile Christians admitted to more than such imperfect communion with the Jewish Christians as that of Proselytes of the Gate in relation to Judaism. This is shown by the conduct of Peter at Antioch after the supposed Council, and of the Jews with him, and even of Barnabas,

[1] *Jowett*, The Eps. of St. Paul, i. 240 f.

[2] *Baur*, K. G., i. p. 51 f., Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 468 ff.; Paulus, i. p. 142 ff.; *Blom*, Theol. Tijdschr., 1870, p. 471 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl., p. 230 f.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 198 f., 202 f.; *Pfleiderer*, Paulinismus, p. 281 f., 284 f.

through fear of the emissaries of James, whose arrival certainly could not have produced a separation between Jewish and Gentile Christians had the latter been recognised as in full communion. The "hands of fellowship" clearly was a mere passive permission of Paul's mission to the Gentiles, but no positive and hearty approval of it testified by active support.[1] It must, we think, be evident to any one who attentively considers the passage we are examining, that there is no question whatever in it of a recognition of the Apostolate of Paul.[2] The elder Apostles consent to his mission to the Gentiles, whilst they themselves go to the circumcision; but there is not a syllable which indicates that Paul's claim to the title of Apostle was ever either acknowledged or discussed. It is not probable that Paul would have submitted such a point to their consideration. It is difficult to see how the elder Apostles could well have done less than they did, and the extent of their fellowship seems to have simply amounted to toleration of what they could not prevent. The pressure for the circumcision of the Gentile converts was an attempt to coerce, and to suppress the peculiar principle of the Gospel of uncircumcision; and though that effort failed through the determined resistance of Paul, it is clear, from the final resolve to limit their preaching

[1] *Baur*, K. G., i. p. 51 f.; Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 468 ff.; Paulus, i. p. 142 ff.; *Blom*, Theol. Tijdschr., 1870, p. 471 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 220 ff.; *Hase*, K. G. 9te Aufl., p. 33 f.; *Hausrath*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 191 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol. 1858, p. 86 f.; 1860, p. 119 ff.; Einl., p. 230 f.; *Jowett*, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 236, 240 ff.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 198, 202 f.; *Pfleiderer*, Paulinismus, p. 281 f., 284 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 121 f.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 73 f.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 192 f.; *Tjeenk-Willink*, Just. Mart., p. 32 f.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch, V. Isr., ii. p. 569 f. Cf. *Alford*, Gk. Test., iii. p. 15.

[2] *Holsten*, Zum Ev. des Paulus, u. s. w., p. 273, anm. *; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 203.

to the circumcision, that the elder Apostles in no way abandoned their view of the necessity of the initiatory rite. The episode at Antioch is a practical illustration of this statement. Hilgenfeld ably remarks:—"When we consider that Peter was afraid of the circumcised Christians, there can be no doubt *that James, at the head of the primitive community, made the attempt to force heathen Christians to adopt the substance of Jewish legitimacy, by breaking off ecclesiastical community with them.*"[1] The Gentile Christians were virtually excommunicated on the arrival of the emissaries of James, or at least treated as mere Proselytes of the Gate; and the pressure upon the Galatian converts of the necessity of circumcision by similar Judaizing emissaries, which called forth the vehement and invaluable Epistle before us, is quite in accordance with the circumstances of this visit. The separation agreed upon between Paul and the elder Apostles was not in any sense geographical, but purely ethnological.[2] It was no mere division of labour,[3] no suitable apportionment of work. The elder Apostles determined, like their Master before them, to confine their ministry to Jews, whilst Paul, if he pleased, might go to the Gentiles; and the mere fact that Peter subsequently goes to Antioch, as well as many other circumstances, shows that no mere separation of locali-

[1] Zeitschr. wiss. Th. 1858, p. 90.

[2] *Baur*, K. G., i. p. 51 f.; Theol. Jahrb., 1849, p. 468 ff.; Paulus, i. p. 142 ff.; *Blom*, Theol. Tijdschr., 1870, p. 471 f.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 220 ff.; *Hausrath*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 191 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1858, p. 86 f.; 1860, p. 119 ff.; Einl., p. 230 f.; *Jowett*, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 240 ff.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 198 f., 202 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 220 f.; *Pfleiderer*, Paulinismus, p. 281 f., 284 f.; *Reuss*, Rev. de Théol., 1859, iii. p. 80; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 130 f.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 73 f.

[3] "They would sanction but not share his mission to the Gentiles.' *Jowett*, The Eps. of St. Paul, i. 236.

ties, but a selection of race was intended. If there had not been this absolute difference of purpose, any separation would have been unnecessary, and all the Apostles would have preached one Gospel indifferently to all who had ears to hear it; such strange inequality in the partition of the work could never have existed: that Paul should go unaided to the gigantic task of converting the heathen, while the Twelve doggedly reserved themselves for the small but privileged people. All that we have said at the beginning of this section of the nature of primitive Christianity, and of the views prevalent amongst the disciples at the death of their Master, is verified by this attitude of the Three during the famous visit of the Apostle of the Gentiles to Jerusalem, and Paul's account is precisely in accordance with all that historical probability and reason, unwarped by the ideal representations of the Acts, prepare us to expect. The more deeply we go into the statements of Paul the more is this apparent, and the more palpable does the inauthenticity of the narrative of the Council appear.

The words of Paul in describing the final understanding are very remarkable and require further consideration. The decision that they should go to the circumcision and Paul to the Gentiles is based upon the recognition of a different Gospel entrusted to him, the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as the Gospel of the circumcision is entrusted to Peter. It will be remembered that Paul states that, on going up to Jerusalem upon this occasion, he communicated to them the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles, and it is probable that he made the journey more especially for this purpose. It appears from the account that this Gospel was not only new to them, but was distinctly different from that of the elder Apostles. If

Paul preached the same Gospel as the rest, what necessity could there have been for communicating it at all? What doubt that by any means he might be running, or had run, in vain? He knew perfectly well that he preached a different Gospel from the Apostles of the circumcision, and his anxiety probably was to secure an amicable recognition of the Gentile converts whom he had taught to consider circumcision unnecessary and the obligation of the law removed. Of course there was much that was fundamentally the same in the two Gospels, starting, as they both did, with the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah; but their points of divergence were very marked and striking, and more especially in directions where the prejudices of the Apostles of the circumcision were the strongest. Avoiding all debatable ground, it is clear that the Gospel of the uncircumcision, which proclaimed the abrogation of the law and the inutility of the initiatory rite, must have been profoundly repugnant to Jews, who still preached the obligation of circumcision and the observance of the law. "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law" [1] said the Gospel of the uncircumcision. "Behold, I, Paul, say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing. . . . For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love." [2] "For neither circumcision is anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." [3] The teaching which was specially designated the Gospel of the circumcision, in contradistinction to this Gospel of the uncircumcision, held very different language. There is no gainsaying the main fact—and that fact, certified by Paul himself and

[1] Gal. iii. 13. [2] Gal. v. 2, 6. [3] Gal. vi. 15.

substantiated by a host of collateral circumstances, is more conclusive than all conciliatory apologetic reasoning —that, at the date of this visit to Jerusalem (C.A.D. 50-52), the Three, after hearing all that Paul had to say, allowed him to go alone to the Gentiles, but themselves would have no part in the mission, and turned as before to the circumcision.

There is another point to which we must very briefly refer. The statements of Paul show that, antecedent to this visit to Jerusalem, Paul had been the active Apostle of the Gentiles, preaching his Gospel of the uncircumcision, and that subsequently he returned to the same field of labour. If we examine the narrative of the Acts, we do not find him represented in any special manner as the Apostle of the Gentiles, but, on the contrary, whilst Peter claims the honour of having been selected that by his voice the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe, Paul is everywhere described as going to the Jews, and only when his teaching is rejected by them does he turn to the Gentiles. It is true that Ananias is represented as being told by the Lord that Paul is a chosen vessel "to bear my name both before Gentiles and kings, and the sons of Israel."[1] And Paul subsequently recounts how the Lord had said to himself, "Go, for I will send thee far hence unto Gentiles."[2] The Author of the Acts, however, everywhere conveys the impression that Paul very reluctantly fulfils this mission, and that if he had but been successful amongst the Jews he never would have gone to the Gentiles at all. Immediately after his conversion, he preaches in the synagogues at Damascus and confounds the Jews,[3] as he

[1] ix. 15 f. [2] xxii. 21; cf. xxvi. 17 ff.
[3] ix. 20, 22.

again does during his visit to Jerusalem.[1] When the Holy Spirit desires the Church at Antioch to separate Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto he has called them, they continue to announce the word of God "in the synagogues of the Jews,"[2] and in narrating the conversion of the Roman proconsul at Paphos, it is said that it is Sergius Paulus himself who calls for Barnabas and Saul, and seeks to hear the word of God.[3] When they came to Antioch in Pisidia, they go into the synagogue of the Jews[4] as usual, and it is only after the Jews reject them that Paul and Barnabas are described as saying:—"It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you: seeing that ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles."[5] In Iconium, to which they next proceed, however, they go into the synagogue of the Jews,[6] and later, it is stated that Paul, on arriving at Thessalonica, "as his custom was," went into the synagogue of the Jews, and for three Sabbaths discoursed to them.[7] At Corinth it was only when the Jews opposed him and blasphemed, that Paul is represented as saying: "Your blood be upon your own head; I will henceforth, with a pure conscience, go unto the Gentiles." It is impossible to distinguish from this narrative any difference between the ministry of Paul and that of the other Apostles. They all address themselves mainly and primarily to the Jews, although if Gentiles desire to eat of "the crumbs which fall from the children's bread" they are not rejected. Even the Pharisees stirred heaven and earth to make proselytes. In no sense can

[1] ix. 28 f. [2] xiii. 5. [3] xiii. 7.
[4] xiii. 14 ff., 42 ff. [5] xiii. 46. [6] xiv. 1 f.
[7] xvii. 1 ff.; cf. 10 ff., 17 ff.; xviii. 4 ff., 19, 23; xix. 8.

the Paul of the Acts be considered specially an Apostle of the Gentiles, and the statement of the Epistle to the Galatians[1] has no significance, if interpreted by the historical work. Apologists usually reply to this objection, that the practice of Paul in the Acts is in accordance with his own words in the Epistle to the Romans, i. 16, in which, it is asserted, he recognizes the right of the Jews to precedence. In the authorised version this passage is rendered as follows:—"For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first and also to the Greek."[2] (*δύναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι.*) As a matter of fact we may here at once state that the word *πρῶτον* "first," is not found in Codices B and G, and that it is omitted from the Latin rendering of the verse quoted by Tertullian.[3] That the word upon which the controversy turns should not be found in so important a MS. as the Vatican Codex is very significant, but proceeding at once to the sense of the sentence, we must briefly state the reasons which seem to us conclusively to show that the usual rendering is erroneous. The passage is an emphatic statement of the principles of Paul. He declares that he is not ashamed of the Gospel, and he immediately states the reason: "for it is a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."[4] He is not ashamed of the Gospel because he recognizes its universality; for, in opposition to the exclusiveness of Judaism, he maintains that all are "sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus... There is neither Jew nor Greek . . . for ye are all one

[1] Gal. ii. 9.
[2] Cf. Rom. ii. 9, 10.
[3] Adv. Marc. v. 13.
[4] Rom. i. 16.

man in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise."[1] "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love."[2] The reason which he gives is that which lies at the basis of the whole of his special teaching; but we are asked to believe that, after so clear and comprehensive a declaration, he at once adds the extraordinary qualification: Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι, rendered "to the Jew first and also to the Greek." What is the meaning of such a limitation? If the Gospel be a power of God unto salvation "to every one that believeth" (παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι), in what manner can it possibly be so "to the Jew first"? Can it be maintained that there are comparative degrees in salvation? "Salvation" is obviously an absolute term. If saved at all, the Jew cannot be more saved than the Greek. If, on the other hand the expression be interpreted as an assertion that the Jew has a right of precedence either in the offer or the attainment of salvation before the Greek, the manner of its realization is almost equally inconceivable, and a host of difficulties, especially in view of the specific Pauline teaching, immediately present themselves. There can be no doubt that the judaistic view distinctly was that Israel must first be saved, before the heathen could obtain any part in the Messianic kingdom, and we have shown that this idea dominated primitive Christianity; but inseparable from this was the belief that the only way to a participation in its benefits lay through Judaism. The heathen could only obtain admission into the family of Israel, and become partakers in the covenant, by submitting to the initiatory rite. It was palpably

[1] Gal. iii. 26 f. [2] Gal. v. 6.

under the influence of this view, and with a conviction that the Messianic kingdom was primarily destined for the children of Israel, that the elder apostles, even after the date of Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, continued to confine their ministry "to the circumcision." Paul's view was very different. He recognized and maintained the universality of the Gospel and, in resolving to go to the heathen, he practically repudiated the very theory of Jewish preference which he is here supposed to advance. If the Gospel, instead of being a power of God to salvation to every man who believed, was for the Jew first, the Apostolate of the Gentiles was a mere delusion and a snare. What could be the advantage of so urgently offering salvation to the Greek, if the gift, instead of being "for every one that believeth," was a mere prospective benefit, inoperative until the Jew had first been saved? "Salvation to the Jew first and also to the Greek," if it have any significance whatever of the kind argued,—involving either a prior claim to the offer of salvation, or precedence in its distribution,—so completely destroys all the present interest in it of the Gentile, that the Gospel must to him have lost all power. To suppose that such an expression simply means, that the Gospel must first be preached to the Jews in any town to which the Apostle might come before it could legitimately be proclaimed to the Gentiles of that town, is childish. We have no reason to suppose that Paul held the deputy Sergius Paulus, who desired to hear the word of God and believed, in suspense until the Jews of Paphos had rejected it. The cases of the Ethiopian eunuch and Cornelius throw no light upon any claim of the Jew to priority in salvation. Indeed, not to waste time in show-

ing the utter incongruity of the ordinary interpretation, we venture to affirm that there is not a single explanation, which maintains a priority assigned to the Jew in any way justifying the reference to this text, which is capable of supporting the slightest investigation. If we linguistically examine the expression Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι, we must maintain that the usual rendering is inaccurate, and disregards the fact that πρῶτον with τε and καὶ is applied equally both to "Jew" and "Greek," and cannot rightly be appropriated to the Jew only, as implying a preference over the Greek.[1] The sense can only be intelligibly given by disregarding πρῶτον and simply translating the words: "both to the Jew and the Greek."[2] This was the rendering of the ancient Latin version quoted by Tertullian in his work against Marcion: "Itaque et hic, cum dicit: Non enim me pudet evangelii, virtus enim dei est in salutem omni credenti, Judæo et Græco, quia justitia dei in eo revelatur ex fide in fidem."[3] We are not left without further examples of the very same expression, and an examination of the context will amply demonstrate that Paul used it in no other sense. In the very next chapter the Apostle twice uses the same words. After condemning the hasty and unrighteous judgment of man, he says: "For we know that the judgment of God is according to truth .... who will render to every one according to his works; to them who by patience in

[1] *Baur*, Theol. Jahrb, 1857, p. 93 ff.; *Beelen*, Comm. in Ep. S. Pauli ad Rom., 1854, p. 22 f., cf. 59 f.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, iv. p. 373; *Stap*, Origines, p. 142 ff.; *Volkmar*, Römerbr., 1875, p. 4, p. 74 f.

[2] Beelen rightly interprets this passage in his Commentary on the Romans: "Sensus ergo est: *Evangelii doctrinam non erubesco; est hæc enim* (γὰρ) *Dei salvifica quædam vis cuicumque qui credit* (παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. Dativus commodi), *sive Judæus sit, sive Gentilis.*" Comment. in Epist. S. Pauli ad Romanos, 1854, p. 23. *Lachmann* puts the word πρῶτον between brackets.

[3] Adv. Marc., v. 13.

well-doing seek for glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life: but unto them that act out of factious spirit and do not obey the truth but obey unrighteousness, anger, and wrath: affliction and distress upon every soul of man that worketh evil, both of the Jew and of the Greek (Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνος, A. V. "of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile"); but glory and honour and peace to every one that worketh good, both to the Jew and to the Greek (Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι, A. V. "to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile"). For there is no respect of persons with God."[1] How is it possible that, if the Apostle had intended to assert a priority of any kind accorded to the Jew before the Gentile, he could at the same time have added: "For there is no respect of persons with God"? If salvation be "to the Jew first," there is very distinctly respect of persons with God. The very opposite, however, is repeatedly and emphatically asserted by Paul in this very epistle. "For there is no difference between Jew and Greek" (οὐ γάρ ἐστιν διαστολὴ Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἕλληνος), he says, "for the same Lord of all is rich unto all them that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."[2] Nothing could be more clear and explicit. The precedence of the Jew is directly excluded. At the end of the second chapter, moreover, he explains his idea of a Jew: "For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outwardly in flesh, but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is of the heart, in spirit not letter."[3] If anything further were required to prove that the Apostle does not by the expression: Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι, intend to indicate any

[1] Rom. ii. 2, 6–11. [2] Rom. x. 12, 13. [3] Rom. ii. 28.

priority accorded to the Jew, it is supplied by the commencement of the third chapter. "What then is the advantage of the Jew? or what the profit of circumcision?" It is obvious that if the Apostle had just said that the Gospel was the power of God unto salvation, "to the Jew first and also to the Greek," he had stated a very marked advantage to the Jew, and that such an inquiry as the above would have been wholly unnecessary. The answer which he gives to his own question, however, completes our certainty. "Much every way," he replies; but in explaining what the "much" advantage was, we hear no more of "to the Jew first:" "Much every way: for first indeed they were entrusted with the oracles of God."[1] And, after a few words, he proceeds: "What then? are we better? Not at all; for we before brought the charge that both Jews and Greeks (Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας) are all under sin."[2] There can be no doubt in the mind of any one who understands what Paul's teaching was, and what he means by claiming the special title of "Apostle to the Gentiles," that in going "to the Heathen" after his visit to Jerusalem, as before it, there was no purpose in his mind to preach to the Jews first and only on being rejected by them to turn to the Gentiles, as the Acts would have us suppose; but that the principle which regulated his proclamation of the Gospel was that which we have already quoted: "For there is no difference between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord of all is rich unto all them that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."[3]

Still more incongruous is the statement of the Acts that Paul took Timothy and circumcised him because of

[1] Rom. iii. 1. [2] Rom. iii. 9. [3] Rom. x. 12, 13.

the Jews. According to this narrative, shortly after the supposed Council of Jerusalem at which it was decided that circumcision of Gentile Converts was unnecessary; immediately after Paul had in spite of great pressure refused to allow Titus to be circumcised; and after it had been agreed between the Apostle of the Gentiles and James and Cephas and John that while they should go to the circumcision, he, on the contrary, should go to the heathen, Paul actually took and circumcised Timothy. Apologists, whilst generally admitting the apparent contradiction, do not consider that this act involves any real inconsistency, and find reasons which, they affirm, sufficiently justify it. Some of these we shall presently examine, but we may at once say that no apologetic arguments seem to us capable of resisting the conclusion arrived at by many independent critics, that the statement of the Acts with regard to Timothy is opposed to all that we know of Paul's views, and that for unassailable reasons it must be pronounced unhistorical.[1] The Author of the Acts says: "And he (Paul) came to Derbe and Lystra. And behold a certain disciple was there, named Timothy, son of a believing Jewish woman, but of a Greek father; who was well reported of by the brethren in Lystra and Iconium. Him would Paul have to go forth with him; and took and circumcised him because of the Jews which were in those places (καὶ λαβὼν περιέτεμεν αὐτὸν διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐκείνοις); for they all knew that his father was a Greek (ᾔδεισαν γὰρ ἅπαντες ὅτι Ἕλλην

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 147 f., anm. 1; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 220; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl., p. 600; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 248 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. P., v. p. 548; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z, ii. p. 82 f.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 136 f., 144 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 217 f.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 238 ff.; Vorträge, p. 209.

ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ὑπῆρχεν)." The principal arguments of those who maintain the truth and consistency of this narrative briefly are: Paul resisted the circumcision of Titus because he was a Greek, and because the subject then actually under consideration was the immunity from the Jewish rite of Gentile Christians, which would have been prejudiced had he yielded the point. On the other hand, Timothy was the son of a Jewish mother, and whilst there was no principle here in question, Paul circumcised the companion whom he had chosen to accompany him in his missionary journey, both as a recognition of his Jewish origin and to avoid offence to the Jews whom they should encounter in the course of their ministry, as well as to secure for him access to the synagogues which they must visit: Paul in this instance, according to all apologists putting in practice his own declaration (1 Cor. ix. 19-20): "For being free from all men, I made myself servant unto all that I might gain the more; and unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews."

It must be borne in mind that the author who chronicles the supposed circumcision of Timothy makes no allusion to the refusal of Paul to permit Titus to be circumcised; an omission which is not only singular in itself, but significant when we find him, immediately after, narrating so singular a concession of which the Apostle makes no mention. Of course it is clear that Paul could not have consented to the circumcision of Titus, and we have only to consider in what manner the case of Timothy differed so as to support the views of those who hold that Paul, who would not yield to the pressure brought to bear upon him in the case of Titus, might, quite consistently, so short a time after,

[1] Acts xvi. 1—3.

circumcise Timothy with his own hand. It is true that the necessity of circumcision for Gentile Christians came prominently into question, during Paul's visit to Jerusalem, from the presence of his uncircumcised follower Titus, and no doubt the abrogation of the rite must have formed a striking part of the exposition of his Gospel, which Paul tells us he made upon this occasion; but it is equally certain that the necessity of circumcision long continued to be pressed by the judaistic party in the Church. It cannot fairly be argued that, at any time, Paul could afford to relax his determined and consistent attitude as the advocate for the universality of Christianity and the abrogation of a rite, insistance upon which, he had been the first to recognise, would have been fatal to the spread of Christianity. To maintain that he could safely make such a concession of his principles and himself circumcise Timothy, simply because at that precise moment there was no active debate upon the point, is inadmissible; for his Epistles abundantly prove that the topic, if it ever momentarily subsided into stubborn silence, was continually being revived with renewed bitterness. Pauline views could never have prevailed if he had been willing to sacrifice them for the sake of conciliation, whenever they were not actively attacked.

The difference of the occasion cannot be admitted as a valid reason; let us, therefore, see whether any difference in the persons and circumstances removes the contradiction. It is argued that such a difference exists in the fact that, whilst Titus was altogether a Gentile, Timothy, on the side of his mother at least, was a Jew; and Thiersch, following a passage quoted by Wetstein, states that, according to Talmudic pre-

scriptions, the validity of mixed marriages between a Jewess and a Gentile was only recognized upon the condition that the children should be brought up in the religion of the mother. In this case, he argues that Paul merely carried out the requirement of the Jewish law by circumcising Timothy, which others had omitted to do, and thus secured his admission to the Jewish synagogues to which much of his ministry was directed, but from which he would have been excluded had the rite not been performed.[1] Even Meyer, however, in reference to this point, replies that Paul could scarcely be influenced by the Talmudic canon, because Timothy was already a Christian and beyond Judaism.[2] Besides, in point of fact, by such a marriage the Jewess had forfeited Jewish privileges. Timothy, in the eyes of the Mosaic law, was not a Jew, and held, in reality, no better position than the Greek Titus. He had evidently been brought up as a heathen, and the only question which could arise in regard to him was whether he must first become a Jew before he could be fully recognized as a Christian. The supposition that the circumcision of Timothy, the son of a Greek, after he had actually become a Christian, without having passed through Judaism, could secure for him free access to the synagogues of the Jews, may show how exceedingly slight at that time was the difference between the Jew and the Christian, but it also suggests the serious doubt whether the object of the concession, in the mind of the Author of the Acts, was not rather to conciliate the Judaic Christians, than to repre-

[1] Die Kirche im ap. Z., p. 138. Ewald similarly argues that Paul circumcised Timothy to remove the stigma attaching to him as the child of such a mixed marriage. Gesch. V. Isr., vi. 445; Jahrb. Bibl. Wiss., 1857—58, ix. p. 64.

[2] Apostelg., p. 354.

sent the act as one of policy towards the unbelieving Jews. The statement of the Acts is that Paul circumcised Timothy "because of the Jews which were in those places; for they knew all that his father was a Greek." If the reason which we are discussing were correct, the expression would more probably have been: "for they knew that his mother was a Jewess." The Greek father might, and probably did, object to the circumcision of his son, but that was no special reason why Paul should circumcise him. On the other hand, the fact that the Jews knew that his father was a Greek made the action attributed to Paul a concession which the Author of the Acts thus represented in its most conciliatory light. The circumcision of Timothy was clearly declared unnecessary by the apostolic decree, for the attempt to show that he was legitimately regarded as a Jew utterly fails. It is obvious that, according to Pauline doctrine, there could be no obligation for anyone who adopted Christianity to undergo this initiatory rite. It is impossible reasonably to maintain that any case has been made out to explain why Timothy who had grown into manhood without being circumcised, and had become a Christian whilst uncircumcised, should at that late period be circumcised. Beyond the reference to a Talmudic prescription, in fact, with which there is not the slightest evidence that Paul was acquainted, and which, even if he did know of it, could not possibly have been recognised by him as authoritative, there has not been a serious attempt made to show that the case of Timothy presents exceptional features which reconcile the contradiction otherwise admitted as apparent.

The whole apologetic argument in fact sinks into one of mere expediency: Timothy, the son of a Jewess

and of a Greek, and thus having a certain affinity both to Jews and Gentiles, would become a much more efficient assistant to Paul if he were circumcised and thus had access to the Jewish synagogues; therefore Paul, who himself became as a Jew that he might win the Jews, demanded the same sacrifice from his follower. But can this argument bear any scrutiny by the light of Paul's own writings? It cannot. Paul openly claims to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, and just before the period at which he is supposed to circumcise Timothy, he parts from the elder Apostles with the understanding that he is to go to the Gentiles who are freed from circumcision. It is a singular commencement of his mission, to circumcise the son of a Greek father after he had become a Christian. Such supposed considerations about access to synagogues and conciliation of the Jews would seem more suitable to a missionary to the circumcision, than to the Apostle of the Gentiles. It must be apparent to all that in going more specially to the Gentiles, as he avowedly was, the alleged expediency of circumcising Timothy falls to the ground, and on the contrary that such an act would have compromised his whole Gospel. Paul's characteristic teaching was the inutility of circumcision, and upon this point he sustained the incessant attacks of the emissaries of James and the Judaistic party without yielding or compromise. What could have been more ill-advised under such circumstances than the circumcision with his own hands of a convert who, if the son of a Jewess, was likewise the son of a Greek, and had remained uncircumcised until he had actually embraced that faith which, Paul taught, superseded circumcision? The Apostle who declared: "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be

circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing,"[1] could not have circumcised the Christian Timothy; and if any utterance of Paul more distinctly and explicitly applicable to the present case be required, it is aptly supplied by the following: "Was any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Hath any man been called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised. . . . Let each abide in the same calling wherein he was called."[2] Apologists quote very glibly the saying of Paul: "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews," as sufficiently justifying the act which we are considering; but it is neither applicable to the case, nor is the passage susceptible of such interpretation. The special object of Paul at that time, according to his own showing,[3] was not to gain Jews but to gain Gentiles; and the circumcision of Timothy would certainly not have tended to gain Gentiles. If we quote the whole passage from which the above is extracted, the sense at once becomes clear and different from that assigned to it: "For being free from all men, I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more; and unto the Jews I became as a Jew that I might gain Jews; to them under law, as under law, not being myself under law, that I might gain them under law; to them without law, as without law,—not being without law to God, but under law to Christ,—that I might gain them without law; to the weak I became weak that I might gain the weak: I am become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some. And all things I do for the Gospel's sake, that I may become a partaker thereof with them."[4] It is clear that a man who could become "all things to all men," in the sense of

[1] Gal. v. 2.
[2] 1 Cor. vii. 18, 20.
[3] Gal. ii. 9.
[4] 1 Cor. ix. 19—23.

yielding any point of principle, must be considered without principle at all, and no one could maintain that Paul was apt to concede principles. Judged by his own statements, indeed, his character was the very reverse of this. There is no shade of conciliation when he declares: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach any Gospel unto you other than that we preached unto you, let him be accursed. . . . For am I now making men my friends, or God? or am I seeking to please men? if I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ."[1] The Gospel of which he speaks, and which he protests "is not after men," but received "through a revelation of Jesus Christ,"[2] is that Gospel which Paul preached among the Gentiles, and which proclaimed the abrogation of the law and of circumcision. Paul might in one sense say that "circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but keeping the commandments of God;"[3] but such a statement, simply intended to express that there was neither merit in the one nor in the other, clearly does not apply to the case before us, and no way lessens the force of the words we have quoted above: "If ye be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing." In Paul such a concession would have been in the highest degree a sacrifice of principle, and one which he not only refused to make in the case of Titus, "that the truth of the Gospel might abide," but equally maintained in the face of the pillar Apostles, when he left them and returned to the Gentiles whilst they went back to the circumcision. Paul's idea of being "all things to all men" is illustrated by his rebuke to Peter,—once more to refer to the scene at Antioch. Peter apparently practised a little of that conciliation, which apologists, defending the unknown Author

[1] Gal. i. 8, 10. [2] Gal. i. 11, 12. [3] 1 Cor. vii. 19.

of the Acts at the expense of Paul, consider to be the sense of the Apostle's words. Paul repudiated such an inference, by withstanding Peter to the face as condemned, and guilty of hypocrisy. Paul became all things to all men by considering their feelings, and exhibiting charity and forbearance, in matters indifferent. He was careful not to make his liberty a stumbling block to the weak. "If food maketh my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh for ever lest I make my brother to offend."[1] Self-abnegation in the use of enlightened liberty, however, is a very different thing from the concession of a rite, which it was the purpose of his whole Gospel to discredit, and the labour of his life to resist. Once more we repeat that the narrative of the Acts regarding the circumcision of Timothy is contradictory to the character and teaching of Paul as ascertained from his Epistles, and like so many other portions of that work which we have already examined must, as it stands, be rejected as unhistorical.

We have already tested the narrative of the Author of the Acts by the statements of Paul in the first two chapters of the Galatians at such length that, although the subject is far from exhausted, we must not proceed further. We think that there can be no doubt that the *rôle* assigned to the Apostle Paul in Acts xv. is unhistorical,[2]

[1] 1 Cor. viii. 13.

[2] *Baur*, K. G., i. p. 126 ff.; Paulus, i. p. 138 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 217 ff., 251 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1858, p. 77 ff.; 1860, p. 121 ff.; Galaterbr., p. 151 f.; Einl., p. 231 f.; *Lipsius*, in Schenkel's B. L., i. p. 196 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 217 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxxvi.; St. Paul, p. 81, note 2; *Scholten*, Het paulin. Ev., p. 448 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. P., v. p. 544 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 117 ff., ii. p. 86 ff.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 69, n. 2, p. 182 ff.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 187 ff.; *Tjeenk-Willink*, Just. Mart., p. 31f., n. 3; *Volkmar*, Die Rel. Jesu, p. 345 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 224 ff.

and it is unnecessary for us to point out the reasons which led the writer to present him in such a subdued light. We must, however, before finally leaving the subject, very briefly point out a few circumstances which throw a singular light upon the relations which actually existed between Paul and the elder Apostles, and tend to show their real, if covert, antagonism to the Gospel of the uncircumcision. We may at the outset remark, in reference to an objection frequently made, that Paul does not distinctly refer to the Apostles as opposing his teaching and does not personally attack them, that such a course would have been suicidal in the Apostle of the Gentiles, whilst on the other hand it could not but have hindered the acceptance of his Gospel, for which he was ever ready to endure so much. The man who wrote: "If it be possible, as much as dependeth on you, be at peace with all men,"[1] could well be silent in such a cause. Paul, in venturing to preach the Gospel of the uncircumcision, laboured under the singular disadvantage of not having, like the Twelve, been an immediate disciple of the Master. He had been "as the one born out of due time,"[2] and although he claimed that his Gospel had not been taught to him by man but had been received by direct revelation from Jesus, there can be no doubt that his apostolic position was constantly assailed. The countenance of the elder Apostles, even if merely tacit, was of great importance to the success of his work; and he felt this so much that, as he himself states, he went up to Jerusalem to communicate to them the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles: "lest by any means I might be running or did run in vain."[3] Any open breach between them would have frustrated his labours. Had Paul been

[1] Rom. xiii. 18. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 8. [3] Gal. ii. 2.

in recognized enmity with the Twelve who had been selected as his special disciples by the Master, and been repudiated and denounced by them, it is obvious that his position would have been a precarious one. He had no desire for schism. His Gospel, besides, was merely a development of that of the elder Apostles; and, however much they might resent his doctrine of the abrogation of the law and of the inutility of circumcision, they could still regard his Gentile converts as at least in some sort Proselytes of the Gate. With every inducement to preserve peace if by any means possible, and to suppress every expression of disagreement with the Twelve, it is not surprising that we find so little direct reference to the elder Apostles in his epistles. During his visit to Jerusalem he did not succeed in converting them to his views. They still limited their ministry to the circumcision, and he had to be content with a tacit consent to his work amongst the heathen. But although we have no open utterance of his irritation, the suppressed impatience of his spirit, even at the recollection of the incidents of his visit, betrays itself in abrupt sentences, unfinished expressions, and grammar which breaks down in the struggle of repressed emotion. We have already said enough regarding his ironical references to those "who seemed to be something," to the "overmuch Apostles," and we need not again point to the altercation between Paul and Cephas at Antioch, and the strong language used by the former. Nothing is more certain than the fact that, during his whole career, the Apostle Paul had to contend with systematic opposition from the Judaic Christian party;[1] and the only

[1] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 161; *Baur*, K. G., i. p. 53 f.; Theol. Jahrb., 1850, p. 165 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 369 f.; *Jowett*,

point regarding which there is any difference of opinion is the share in this taken by the Twelve. As we cannot reasonably expect to find any plain statement of this in the writings of the Apostle, we are forced to take advantage of such indications as can be discovered. Upon one point we are not left in doubt. The withdrawal of Peter and the others at Antioch from communion with the Gentile Christians, and consequently from the side of Paul, was owing to the arrival of certain men from James, for the Apostle expressly states so. No surprise is expressed, however, at the effect produced by these τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, and the clear inference is that they represented the views of a naturally antagonistic party, an inference which is in accordance with all that we elsewhere read of James. It is difficult to separate the τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου from the τινές of the preceeding chapter (i.7) who "trouble" the Galatians, and "desire to pervert the Gospel of Christ," asserting the necessity of circumcision, against whom the epistle is directed. Again we meet with the same vague and cautious designation of judaistic opponents in his second epistle to the Corinthians (iii. 1), where "some" (τινές) bearers of "letters of commendation" (συστατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν) from persons unnamed, were attacking the Apostle and endeavouring to discredit his teaching. By whom were these letters written? We cannot of course give an authoritative reply, but we may ask: by whom could letters of commendation possessing an

Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 332 ff.; *Kurtz*, Lehrb. K. G., i. p. 45 f.; *Lang*, Rel. Charaktere, p. 69 ff.; *Lechler*, Das ap. u. nachap. Z., p. 379 ff.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 299 f.; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 414 ff.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 273 ff.; *Nicolas*, Études, N. T., p. 256 ff.; *Renan*, St. Paul, p. 299 f.; *Réville*, Essais, p. 29 ff.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 156 ff., ii. p. 107ff.; *Stap*, Origines, p. 84 ff., 113 f.; *Zeller*, Vorträge, p. 211 f.

authority which could have weight against that of Paul be written, except by the elder Apostles ?[1] We have certain evidence in the first Epistle to the Corinthians that parties had arisen in the Church of Corinth in opposition to Paul. These parties were distinguished, as the Apostle himself states, by the cries : "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ."[2] (ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλώ, ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ.) Whatever differences of opinion there may be as to the precise nature of these parties, there can be no doubt that both the party "of Cephas" and the party "of Christ" held strong Judaistic views and assailed the teaching of Paul, and his apostolic authority. It is very evident that the persons to whom the apostle refers in connection with "letters of commendation" were of these parties. Apologists argue that: "in claiming Cephas as the head of their party they had probably neither more nor less ground than their rivals who sheltered themselves under the names of Apollos and of Paul."[3] It is obvious, however, that, in a Church founded by Paul, there could have been no party created with the necessity to take his name as their watchword, except as a reply to another party which, having intruded itself, attacked him, and

[1] A curious corroboration of this conclusion was found in the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions :—

διὸ πρὸ πάντων μέμνησθε ἀπόστολον ἢ διδάσκαλον ἢ προφήτην φεύγειν μὴ πρότερον ἀκριβῶς ἀντιβάλλοντα αὐτοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰακώβῳ τῷ λεχθέντι ἀδελφῷ τοῦ κυρίου μου καὶ πεπιστευμένῳ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν Ἑβραίων διέπειν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ μετὰ μαρτύρων προσεληλυθότα πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Hom. xi. 35.

Propter quod observate cautius, ut nulli doctorum credatis, nisi qui Jacobi fratris Domini ex Hierusalem detulerit testimonium, vel ejus, quicunque post ipsum fuerit. Nisi enim quis illuc ascenderit, et ibi fuerit probatus, quod sit doctor idoneus et fidelis ad prædicandum Christi verbum, nisi, inquam, inde detulerit testimonium, recipiendus omnino non est. Recog. iv. 35.

[2] 1 Cor. i. 12.

[3] *Lightfoot*, St. Paul's Ep. to the Galatians, 1874, p. 355.

forced those who maintained the views of their own Apostle to raise such a counter-cry. The parties "of Cephas'" and "of Christ" were manifestly aggressive, intruding themselves, as the Apostle complains, into "other men's labours,"[1] and this in some manner seems to point to that convention between the Apostle and the Three, that he should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcision which, barely more than passive neutrality at the beginning, soon became covertly antagonistic. The fact that the party "of Paul" was not an organized body, so to say, directed by the Apostle as a party leader, in no way renders it probable that the party of Cephas, which carried on active and offensive measures, had not much more ground in claiming Cephas as their head. One point is indisputable, that no party ever claims any man as its leader who is not clearly associated with the views it maintains. The party "of Cephas," representing Judaistic views, opposing the teaching of Paul, and joining in denying his apostolic claims, certainly would not have taken Peter's name as their watch-cry if he had been known to hold and express such Pauline sentiments as are put into his mouth in the Acts, or had not, on the contrary, been intimately identified with judaistic principles. To illustrate the case by a modern instance: Is it possible to suppose that, in any considerable city in this country, a party holding ritualistic opinions could possibly claim the present Archbishop of Canterbury as its leader, or one professing "broad-church" views could think of sheltering itself under the name of the Archbishop of York? Religious parties may very probably mistake the delicate details of a leader's teaching, but they can scarcely be wrong in regard to his general principles. If Peter had

[1] 2 Cor. x. 13 ff.

been so unfortunate as to be flagrantly misunderstood by his followers and, whilst this party preached in his name judaistic doctrines and anti-Pauline opinions, the Apostle himself advocated the abrogation of the law, as a burden which the Jews themselves were not able to bear, and actively shared Pauline convictions, is it possible to suppose that Paul would not have pointed out the absurdity of such a party claiming such a leader?

The fact is, however, that Paul never denies the claim of those who shelter themselves under the names of Peter and James, never questions their veracity, and never adopts the simple and natural course of stating that, in advancing these names, they are imposters or mistaken. On the contrary, upon all occasions he evidently admits, by his silence, the validity of the claim.[1] We are not left to mere inference that the adopted head of the party actually shared the views of the party. Paul himself distinguishes Peter as the head of the party of the circumcision in a passage in his letter to the Galatians already frequently referred to,[2] and the episode at Antioch confirms the description. Upon that occasion, Peter retracts a momentary concession made under the influence of Paul and of a Gentile community, and no doubt is left that his permanent practice was to force the Gentiles to judaize. For reasons which we have already stated, Paul could not but have desired to preserve peace, or even the semblance of it, with the elder Apostles, for the Gospel's sake; and he, therefore, wisely leaves them as much as possible out of the question and deals with their disciples. It is obvious that mere policy must have dictated such a course. By ignoring the leaders and attacking their

[1] *Réville*, Essais de Critique religieuse, 1860, p. 16 f.
[2] Gal. ii. 7 f.

followers, he suppressed the chief strength of his opponents and kept out of sight the most formidable argument against himself: the concurrence with them of the elder Apostles. On the one hand, the epistles of Paul bear no evidence to any active sympathy and co-operation with his views and work on the part of the elder Apostles. Had any real unanimity existed between them and any positive support been given to him by the Twelve, it is impossible to suppose that, under the circumstances, Paul would not have allowed the fact to be plainly perceptible in his writings, in which so many opportunities occur. On the other hand, Paul is everywhere assailed by judaistic adversaries who oppose his Gospel and deny his apostleship, and who claim as their leaders the elder Apostles. Paul does not deny the truth of their pretentions, and combats them alone and unaided, but with an under-current of suppressed bitterness against their leaders which cannot be ignored. We shall not again refer to the expressions in the Epistle to the Galatians, but no one can read these letters to the Corinthians, which bear on their very front, as the reason which has called them forth, the existence of such parties, without recognizing that the apostle not only does not, and cannot, contradict the claim of the party "of Cephas," for instance, but feels its substantial truth.

If, even without pressing expressions to their extreme and probable point, we take the contrast drawn between his own Gospel and that of the circumcision, the reality of the antagonism must be apparent. "For we are not as the many (οἱ πολλοὶ[1]) which adul-

[1] Although this reading is supported by the oldest MSS. such as A B C K ℵ and others, the reading οἱ λοιποί, "the rest," stands in D E F G I and a large number of other codices, and is defended by many critics as the original which they argue was altered to οἱ πολλοί, to soften

terate the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as of God, before God, speak we in Christ."[1] Later on in the letter, after referring to the intrusion of the opposite party into the circle of his labours, Paul declares that his impatience and anxiety proceed from godly jealousy at the possible effect of the judaistic intruders upon the Corinthians. "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, your thoughts should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus whom we did not preach, or if ye receive another spirit which ye received not, or another Gospel which ye did not accept, ye bear well with him. For I think I am not a whit behind the overmuch Apostles (*τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων*)."[2] This reference to the elder Apostles gives point to much of the epistle which is ambiguous, and more especially when the judaistic nature of the opposition is so clearly indicated a few verses further on: "Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they Abraham's seed? so am I. Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool), I am more; in labours more abundantly, in prisons exceedingly, in deaths often," &c., &c.[3]

It is argued that the Twelve had not sufficient authority over their followers to prevent such interference with Paul, and that the relation of the Apostle to the Twelve was: "separation, not opposition, antagonism of the followers rather than of the leaders, personal antipathy of the Judaizers to St. Paul, rather than of St. Paul to the Twelve."[4] It is not difficult to believe that

the apparent hardness of such an expression, which would seem to imply that Paul declared himself the sole true exponent of the Gospel.

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 17. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 2—5; cf. Gal. i. 6 ff. [3] 2 Cor. xi. 22 ff.

[4] *Jowett*, The Eps. of St. Paul, 1855, i. p. 326, 330.

the antipathy of Paul to the Judaizers was less than that felt by them towards him. The superiority of the man must have rendered him somewhat callous to such dislike.[1] But the mitigated form of difference between Paul and the Twelve here assumed, although still very different from the representations of the Acts, cannot be established, but on the contrary must be much widened before it can justly be taken as that existing between Paul and the elder Apostles. We do not go so far as to say that there was open enmity between them, or active antagonism of any distinct character on the part of the Twelve to the Apostle of the Gentiles, but there is every reason to believe that they not only disliked his teaching, but endeavoured to counteract it by their own ministry of the circumcision. They not only did not restrain the opposition of their followers, but they abetted them in their counter-assertion of judaistic views. Had the Twelve felt any cordial friendship for Paul, and exhibited any active desire for the success of his ministry of the uncircumcision, it is quite impossible that his work could have been so continuously and vexatiously impeded by the persecution of the Jewish Christian party. The Apostles may not have possessed sufficient influence or authority entirely to control the action of adherents, but it would be folly to suppose that, if unanimity of views had prevailed between them and Paul, and a firm and consistent support had been extended to him, such systematic resistance as he everwhere encountered from a party professing to be led by the "pillar" Apostles could

[1] We do not think it worth while to refer to the argument that the collections made by Paul for the poor of Jerusalem, &c., in times of distress proves the unanimity which prevailed between them. Charity is not a a matter of doctrine, and the Good Samaritan does not put the suffering man through his catechism before he relieves his wants.

have been seriously maintained, or that he could have been left alone and unaided to struggle against it. If the relations between Paul and the Twelve had been such as are intimated in the Acts of the Apostles, his epistles must have presented undoubted evidence of the fact. Both negatively and positively they testify the absence of all support, and the existence of antagonistic influence on the part of the elder Apostles, and external evidence fully confirms the impression which the epistles produce.[1]

From any point of view which may be taken, the Apocalypse is an important document in connection

[1] "Everywhere in the Epistles of St. Paul and in the Acts of the Apostles, we find traces of an opposition between the Jew and the Gentile, the circumcision and the uncircumcision. It is found, not only in the Epistle to the Galatians, but in a scarcely less aggravated form in the two Epistles to the Corinthians, softened, indeed, in the Epistle to the Romans, and yet distinctly traceable in the Epistle to the Philippians; the party of the circumcision appearing to triumph in Asia, at the very close of the Apostle's life, in the second Epistle to Timothy. In all these Epistles we have proofs of a reaction to Judaism, but though they are addressed to Churches chiefly of Gentile origin, never of a reaction to heathenism. Could this have been the case, unless within the Church itself there had been a Jewish party urging upon the members of the Church the performance of a rite repulsive in itself, if not as necessary to salvation, at any rate as a counsel of perfection, seeking to make them in Jewish language, not merely proselytes of the gate, but proselytes of righteousness? What, if not this, is the reverse side of the Epistles of St. Paul? that is to say, the motives, object, or basis of teaching of his opponents, who came with 'epistles of commendation' to the Church of Corinth, 2 Cor. iii. 1; who profess themselves 'to be Christ's' in a special sense, 2 Cor. x. 7; who say they are of Apollos, or Cephas, or Christ, 1 Cor. i. 12; or James, Gal. ii. 12; who preach Christ of contention, Phil. i. 15, 17; who deny St. Paul's authority, 1 Cor. ix. 1, Gal. iv. 16; who slander his life, 1 Cor. ix. 3, 7. We meet these persons at every turn. Are they the same, or different? Are they mere chance opponents? or do they represent to us one spirit, one mission, one determination to root out the Apostle and his doctrine from the Christian Church? Nothing but the fragmentary character of St. Paul's writings would conceal from us the fact, that here was a concerted and continuous opposition." *Jowett*, The Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 332 f.

with this point. If it be accepted as a work of the Apostle John—the preponderence of evidence and critical opinion assigns it to him—this book, of course, possesses the greatest value as an indication of his views. If it be merely regarded as a contemporary writing, it still is most interesting as an illustration of the religious feeling of the period. The question is: Does the Apocalypse contain any reference to the Apostle Paul, or throw light upon the relations between him and the elder Apostles? If it does so, and be the work of one of the στῦλοι, nothing obviously could be more instructive. In the messages to the seven churches, there are references and denunciations which, in the opinion of many able critics, are directed against the Apostle of the Gentiles and his characteristic teaching.[1] Who but Paul and his followers can be referred to in the Epistle to the Church of Ephesus: "I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and that thou canst not bear wicked persons: and didst try them which say they are Apostles and are not, and didst find them liars"?[2] Paul himself informs us not only of his sojourn in Ephesus, where he believed that "a great and effectual door" was opened to him, but adds, "there are many adversaries" (ἀντικείμενοι πολλοί).[3] The foremost charge brought against the churches is that they have those that hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the sons of Israel, "to eat things offered

[1] *Baur*, K. G., i. p. 80 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Einl., p. 413 ff.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, i. p. 160, anm. 2; *Renan*, St. Paul, p. 303 ff., 367 f.; *Rovers*, Heeft Paulus zich ter verdedig. van zijn Apost. op Wond. beroepen? 1870, p. 32 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., i. p. 172 f., ii. p. 116; *Tjeenk-Willink*, Just. Mart., p. 45; *Volkmar*, Comm. Offenb. Johannis, 1862, p. 25 ff., 80 ff.; *Zeller*, Vorträge, p. 215 f. Cf. *Köstlin*, Lehrb. d. Ev. u. Br. Johannis, 1843, p. 486 f.; *Ritschl*, Entst. altk. K., p. 134 f.

[2] ii. 2. [3] 1 Cor. xvi. 9.

unto idols."[1] The teaching of Paul upon this point is well known, 1 Cor. viii. 1 ff., x. 25. ff., Rom. xiv. 2 ff., and the reference here cannot be mistaken; and when in the Epistle to the church of Thyatira, after denouncing the teaching "to eat things offered unto idols," the Apocalyptist goes on to encourage those who have not this teaching, "who knew not the depths of Satan, (*τὰ βάθη τοῦ σατανᾶ*),[2] as they say" the expression of Paul himself is taken to denounce his doctrine; for the Apostle, defending himself against the attacks of those parties "of Cephas" and "of Christ" in Corinth, writes: "But God revealed (them) to us through his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, even the depths of God" (*τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ*)—"the depths of Satan" rather, retorts the judaistic author of the Apocalypse. *τὰ βάθη* does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. Again, in the address to the churches of Smyrna and Philadelphia, when the writer denounces those "who say that they are Jews, and are not, but a synagogue of Satan,"[3] whom has he in view but those Christians whom Paul had taught to consider cir-

[1] Apoc. ii. 14, 20. We do not enter upon the discussion as to the exact interpretation of *πορνεῦσαι*, which is always associated with the *φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα*, regarding which opinions differ very materially. It is probable that the apocalyptist connected the eating of things offered to idols with actual idolatrous worship. It is not improbable that the maxim of Paul: "all things are lawful unto me" (*πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν*), 1 Cor. vi. 12, x. 23, may have been abused by his followers, and, in any case, such a sentiment, coupled with Paul's teaching and his abandonment of the Law, must have appeared absolute license to the judaistic party. We must also pass over the discussion regarding the signification of "Balaam." This and other points are fully dealt with by several of the writers indicated in note 1 p. 314. The Nicolaitans are not only classed as followers of the teaching of Balaam, but as adherents of Paul.

[2] Apoc. ii. 24. This is the reading of ℵ, P, and some other codices; A, B, C, read *τὰ βαθέα*.

[3] Apoc. ii. 9, iii. 9.

cumcision unnecessary and the law abrogated? We find Paul in the Epistle to the Corinthians, so often quoted, obliged to defend himself against these judaising parties upon this very point: "Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they Abraham's seed? so am I."[1] It is manifest that his adversaries had vaunted their own Jewish origin as a title of superiority over the Apostle of the Gentiles. We have, however, further evidence of the same attack upon Paul regarding this point. Epiphanius points out that the Ebionites denied that Paul was a Jew, and asserted that he was born of a Gentile father and mother, but, having gone up to Jerusalem, that he became a proselyte and submitted to circumcision in the hope of marrying a daughter of the high priest. But afterwards, according to them, enraged at not securing the maiden for his wife, Paul wrote against circumcision and the Sabbath and the law.[2] The Apostle Paul, whose constant labour it was to destroy the particularism of the Jew, and raise the Gentile to full, free, and equal participation with him in the benefits of the New Covenant, could not but incur the bitter displeasure of the Apocalyptist, for whom the Gentiles were, as such, the type of all that was common and unclean. In the utterances of the seer of Patmos we

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 22; cf. Philip. iii. 4 ff.

[2] . . . καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ κενοφωνίας ἔμπλεα, ὡς καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐνταῦθα κατηγοροῦντες οὐκ αἰσχύνονται ἐπιπλάστοις τισὶ τῆς τῶν ψευδαποστόλων αὐτῶν κακουργίας καὶ πλάνης λόγοις πεποιημένοις. Ταρσέα μὲν αὐτὸν, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁμολογεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀρνεῖται, λέγοντες ἐξ Ἑλλήνων δὲ αὐτὸν ὑποτίθενται, λαβόντες τὴν πρόφασιν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου διὰ τὸ φιλάληθες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ῥηθὲν, ὅτι, Ταρσεύς εἰμι, οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης. Εἶτα φάσκουσιν αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἕλληνα, καὶ Ἑλληνίδος μητρὸς καὶ Ἕλληνος πατρὸς παῖδα, ἀναβεβηκέναι δὲ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ χρόνον ἐκεῖ μεμενηκέναι, ἐπιτεθυμηκέναι δὲ θυγατέρα τοῦ ἱερέως πρὸς γάμον ἀγαγέσθαι, καὶ τούτου ἕνεκα, προσήλυτον γενέσθαι καὶ περιτμηθῆναι, εἶτα μὴ λαβόντα τὴν κόρην ὠργίσθαι, καὶ κατὰ ἐπιτομῆς γεγραφέναι, καὶ κατὰ σαββάτου καὶ νομοθεσίας. Hær. xxx. 16.

seem to hear the expression of all that judaistic hatred and opposition which pursued the Apostle who laid the axe to the root of Mosaism and, in his efforts to free Christianity from trammels which, more than any other, retarded its triumphant development, aroused against himself all the virulence of Jewish illiberality and prejudice.

The results at which we have arrived might be singularly confirmed by an examination of the writings of the first two centuries, and by observing the attitude assumed towards the Apostle of the Gentiles by such men as Justin Martyr, Papias, Hegesippus, and the Author of the Clementines; but we have already devoted too much space to this subject, and here we must reluctantly leave it.

The steps by which Christianity was gradually freed from the trammels of Judaism and became a religion of unlimited range and universal fitness were clearly not those stated in the Acts of the Apostles. Its emancipation from Mosaism was not effected by any liberal action or enlightened guidance on the part of the elder Apostles. At the death of their Master, the Twelve remained closely united to Judaism, and evidently were left without any understanding that Christianity was a new religion which must displace Mosaic institutions, and replace the unbearable yoke of the law by the divine liberty of the Gospel. To the last moment regarding which we have any trustworthy information, the Twelve, as might have been expected, retained all their early religious customs and all their Jewish prejudices. They were simply Jews believing that Jesus was the Messiah; and if the influence of Paul enlarged their views upon some minor points, we have no reason to believe that

they ever abandoned their belief in the continued obligation of the law, and the necessity of circumcision for full participation in the benefits of the Covenant. The Author of the Acts would have us believe that they required no persuasion, but anticipated Paul in the Gospel of uncircumcision. It is not within the scope of this work to inquire how Paul originally formed his views of Christian universalism. Once formed, it is easy to understand how rapidly they must have been developed and confirmed by experience amongst the Gentiles. Whilst the Twelve still remained in the narrow circle of Judaism and could not be moved beyond the ministry of the circumcision, Paul, in the larger and freer field of the world, must daily have felt more convinced that the abrogation of the Law and the abandonment of circumcision were essential to the extension of Christianity amongst the Gentiles. He had no easy task, however, to convince others of this, and he never succeeded in bringing his elder colleagues over to his views. To the end of his life Paul had to contend with bigoted and narrow-minded opposition within the Christian body, and if his views ultimately triumphed, and the seed which he sowed eventually yielded a rich harvest, he himself did not live to see the day, and the end was attained only by slow and natural changes. The new religion gradually extended beyond the limits of Judaism. Gentile Christians soon outnumbered Jewish believers. The Twelve whose names were the strength of the judaistic opposition one by one passed away; but, above all, the fall of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Christian community secured the success of Pauline principles and the universalism of Christianity. The Church of Jerusalem could not bear transplanting. In the uncongenial

soil of Pella it gradually dwindled away, losing first its influence and soon after its nationality. The divided members of the Jewish party, scattered amongst the Gentiles, and deprived of their influential leaders, could not long retard the progress of the liberalism which they still continued to oppose and to misrepresent. In a word, the emancipation of Christianity was not effected by the Twelve, was no work of councils, and no result of dreams; but, receiving its first great impulse from the genius and the energy of Paul, its ultimate achievement was the result of time and natural development.

We have now patiently considered the "Acts of the Apostles," and although it has in no way been our design exhaustively to examine its contents, we have more than sufficiently done so to enable the reader to understand the true character of the document. The author is unknown, and it is no longer possible to identify him. If he were actually the Luke whom the Church indicates, our results would not be materially affected; but the mere fact that the writer is unknown is obviously fatal to the Acts as a guarantee of miracles. A cycle of supernatural occurrences could scarcely, in the estimation of any rational mind, be established by the statement of an anonymous author, and more especially one who not only does not pretend to have been an eye-witness of most of the miracles, but whose narrative is either uncorroborated by other testimony or inconsistent with itself, and contradicted on many points by contemporary documents. The phenomena presented by the Acts of the Apostles become perfectly intelligible when we recognize that it is the work of a writer living long after the

occurrences related, whose pious imagination furnished the apostolic age with an elaborate system of supernatural agency, far beyond the conception of any other New Testament writer, by which, according to his view, the proceedings of the apostles were furthered and directed, and the infant Church miraculously fostered. On examining other portions of his narrative, we find that they present the features which the miraculous elements rendered antecedently probable. The speeches attributed to different speakers are all cast in the same mould, and betray the composition of one and the same writer. The sentiments expressed are inconsistent with what we know of the various speakers. And when we test the circumstances related, by previous or subsequent incidents and by trustworthy documents, it becomes apparent that the narrative is not an impartial statement of facts, but a reproduction of legends or a development of tradition, shaped and coloured according to the purpose or the pious views of the writer. The Acts of the Apostles, therefore, is not only an anonymous work, but upon due examination its claims to be considered sober and veracious history must be emphatically rejected. It cannot strengthen the foundations of Supernatural Religion, but, on the contrary, by its profuse and indiscriminate use of the miraculous it discredits miracles, and affords a clearer insight into their origin and fictitious character.

PART II.

THE DIRECT EVIDENCE FOR MIRACLES.

CHAPTER I.

THE EPISTLES AND THE APOCALYPSE.

Turning from the Acts of the Apostles to the other works of the New Testament, we shall be able very briefly to dispose of the Catholic Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. The so-called Epistles of James, Jude, and John, do not contain any evidence which, even supposing them to be authentic, really bears upon our inquiry into the reality of Miracles and Divine Revelation; and the testimony of the Apocalypse affects it quite as little. We have already, in examining the fourth Gospel, had occasion to say a good deal regarding both the so-called Epistles of John and the Apocalypse. It is unnecessary to enter upon a more minute discussion of them here. "Seven books of the New Testament," writes Dr. Westcott, "as is well known, have been received into the Canon on evidence less complete than that by which the others are supported."[1] These are "the Epistles of James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse." We have already furnished the means of judging of the nature of the

[1] On the Canon, 4th ed., p. 347.

evidence upon which some of the other books have been received into the Canon, and the evidence for most of these being avowedly "less complete," its nature may be conceived. Works which for a long period were classed amongst the Antilegomena, or disputed books, and which only slowly acquired authority as, in the lapse of time, it became more difficult to examine their claims, could scarcely do much to establish the reality of miracles. With regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we may remark that we are freed from any need to deal at length with it, not only by the absence of any specific evidence in its contents, but by the following consideration. If the Epistle be not by Paul,—and it not only is not his, but does not even pretend to be so,—the author is unknown, and therefore the document has no weight as testimony. On the other hand, if assigned to Paul, we shall have sufficient ground in his genuine epistles for considering the evidence of the Apostle, and it could not add anything even if the Epistle to the Hebrews were included in the number.

The first Epistle of Peter might have required more detailed treatment, but we think that little could be gained by demonstrating that the document is not authentic, or showing that, in any case, the evidence which it could furnish is not of any value. On the other hand, we are averse to protract the argument by any elaboration of mere details which can be avoided. If it could be absolutely proved that the Apostle Peter wrote the epistle circulating under his name, the evidence for miracles would only be strengthened by the fact that incidentally the doctrine of the Resurrection of Jesus is maintained. No historical details are given, and no explanation of the reasons for which the writer believed in it.

Nothing more would be proved than the point that Peter himself believed in the Resurrection. It would certainly be a matter of very deep interest if we possessed a narrative written by the apostle himself, giving minute and accurate details of the phenomena in consequence of which he believed in so miraculous an event; but since this epistle does nothing more than allow us to infer the personal belief of the writer, unaccompanied by corroborative evidence, we should not gain anything by accepting it as genuine. We are quite willing to assume, without further examination, that the Apostle Peter in some way believed in the Resurrection of his Master. For the argument regarding the reality of that stupendous miracle, upon which we are about to enter, this is tantamount to assuming the authenticity of the epistle.

Coming to the Epistles of Paul, it will not be necessary to go into the evidence for the various letters in our New Testament which are ascribed to him, nor shall we require to state the grounds upon which the authenticity of many of them is denied. Accepting the Epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians and Romans in the main as genuine compositions of the Apostle, the question as to the origin of the rest, so far as our inquiry is concerned, has little or no interest. From these four letters we obtain the whole evidence of Paul regarding miracles, and this we now propose carefully to examine. One point in particular demands our fullest attention. It is undeniable that Paul preached the doctrine of the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus, and believed in those events. Whilst, therefore, we shall not pass over his supposed testimony for the possession of miraculous powers, we shall chiefly devote our attention to his evidence for the central dogmas of Supernatural Religion, the Resurrection and Ascension of

Jesus. We shall not, however, limit our examination to the testimony of Paul, but, as the climax of the historical argument for miracles, endeavour to ascertain the exact nature of the evidence upon which belief is claimed for the actual occurence of those stupendous events. For this, our inquiry into the authorship and credibility of the historical books of the New Testament has at length prepared us, and it will be admitted that, in subjecting these asserted miracles to calm and fearless scrutiny—untinged by irreverence or disrespect, if personal earnestness and sincere sympathy with those who believe are any safeguards,—the whole theory of Christian miracles will be put to its final test.

CHAPTER II.

THE EVIDENCE OF PAUL.

It is better, before proceeding to examine the testimony of Paul for the Resurrection, to clear the way by considering his evidence for miracles in general, apart from that specific instance. In an earlier portion of this work[1] the following remark was made: "Throughout the New Testament, patristic literature, and the records of ecclesiastical miracles, although we have narratives of countless wonderful works performed by others than the writer, and abundant assertion of the possession of miraculous power by the Church, there is no instance whatever, that we can remember, in which a writer claims to have himself performed a miracle."[2] It is asserted that this statement is erroneous, and that Paul does advance this claim.[3] It may be well to quote the moderate

[1] i. p. 200 f.

[2] Dr. Kuenen has made a very similar remark regarding the Old Testament. He says: "When Ezra and Nehemiah relate to us what they themselves did or experienced, there does not appear in their narratives a single departure from the common order of things. On the other hand, these departures are very numerous in the accounts which are separated by a greater or lesser interval from the time to which they refer." De Godsdienst van Israël, 1869, i. p. 22.

[3] *Dr. Westcott*, speaking of the author of S. R., says: "He is far more familiar, unless I am mistaken, with some modern German and Dutch speculations on the Gospels and early Church history, than with the New Testament itself . . . ." (and in a note to this) "One or two examples of grave inaccuracy as to the letter of the New Testament may be given to justify my statement," . . . and after quoting from the above pas-

words in which a recent able writer states the case, although not with immediate reference to the particular passage which we have quoted. ". . . In these undoubted writings St. Paul certainly shows by incidental allusions, the good faith of which cannot be questioned, that he believed himself to be endowed with the power of working miracles, and that miracles, or what were thought to be such, were actually wrought both by him and by his contemporaries. He reminds the Corinthians that 'the signs of an Apostle were wrought among them . . . in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds' (ἐν σημείοις καὶ τέρασι καὶ δυνάμεσι—the usual words for the higher forms of miracle —2 Cor. xii. 12). He tells the Romans that 'he will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by[1] him to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God' (ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος Θεοῦ, Rom. xv. 18, 19). He asks the

sage: "There is no instance . . . ." to "claims to have himself performed a miracle," Dr. Westcott adds: "Can the writer have forgotten Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12?" On the Canon, 4th ed., 1874, p. xxx. *Dr. Lightfoot* says: "Thus again, he can remember 'no instance whatever,' where a New Testament writer 'claims to have himself performed a miracle,' though St. Paul twice speaks of his exercising this power as a recognized and patent fact (note, Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12). The point to be observed is, that St. Paul treats the fact of his working miracles as a matter of course, to which a passing reference is sufficient." The Contemporary Review, May 1875, p. 854. May I suggest that the defence of Christianity from an "attack" made in a very serious and inquiring spirit has, on the part of these two writers, perhaps rather too much taken the shape of picking out a few supposed errors of detail, and triumphantly shaking them with a persistence not characteristic of strength. To twit an advancing foe with having lost a button of his tunic will scarcely repel his charge.

[1] These words are printed "in him," but we venture to correct what seems evidently to be a mere misprint, substituting "by," (διά) as in the authorized version, to which Mr. Sanday adheres throughout the whole of these passages, even when it does not represent the actual sense of the original.

Galatians whether 'he that ministereth to them the Spirit, and worketh miracles (ὁ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις) among them, doeth it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?' (Gal. iii. 5.) In the first Epistle to the Corinthians, he goes somewhat elaborately into the exact place in the Christian economy that is to be assigned to the working of miracles and gifts of healing (1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29)." [1]

We shall presently examine these passages, but we must first briefly deal with the question whether, taken in any sense, they furnish an instance "in which a writer claims to have himself performed *a miracle*." It must be obvious to any impartial reader, that the remark made in the course of our earlier argument precisely distinguished the general "assertion of the possession of miraculous power by the Church," from the explicit claim to have personally performed "a miracle" in the singular. If, therefore, it were even admitted "that St. Paul treats the fact of his working miracles as a matter of course, *to which a passing reference is sufficient*," such "incidental allusions" would not in the least degree contradict the statement made, but, being the only instances producible, would in fact completely justify it. General and vague references of this kind have by no means the force of a definite claim to have performed some particular miracle. They partake too much of that indiscriminate impression of the possession and common exercise of miraculous powers which characterized the "age of miracles" to have any force. The desired instance, which is not forthcoming and to which alone reference was made, was a case in which, instead of vague expressions, a writer, stating with precision the particulars, related that he himself had,

[1] *Sanday*, the Gospels in the Second Century, 1876, p. 11.

for instance, actually raised some person from the dead. As we then added, even if Apostles had chronicled their miracles, the argument for their reality would not have been much advanced; but it is a curious phenomenon not undeserving of a moment's attention that apologists can only refer to such general passages, and cannot quote an instance in which a specific miracle is related in detail by the person who is supposed to have performed it. Passing references on a large scale to the exercise of miraculous power, whilst betraying a suspicious familiarity with phenomena of an exceptional nature, offer too much latitude for inaccurracy and imagination to have the weight of an affirmation in which the mind has been sobered by concentration to details. "Signs and wonders," indefinitely alluded to, may seem much more imposing and astonishing than they really are, and it may probably be admitted by everyone that, if we knew the particulars of the occurrences which are thus vaguely indicated and which may have been considered miraculous in a superstitious age, they might to us possibly appear no miracles at all. General expressions are liable to an exaggeration from which specific allegations are more frequently free. If it be conceded that the Apostle Paul fully believed in the possession by himself and the Church of divine Charismata, the indefinite expression of that belief, in any form, must not be made equivalent to an explicit claim to have performed a certain miracle, the particulars of which are categorically stated.

Passing from this, however, to the more general question, the force of some of these objections will be better understood when we consider the passages in the Epistles which are quoted as expressing Paul's belief in miracles, and endeavour to ascertain his real views: what it is he

actually says regarding miracles; and what are the phenomena which are by him considered to be miraculous. We shall not waste time in considering how, largely through the influence of the Septuagint, the words σημεῖον, τέρας, and δύναμις came to be used in a peculiar manner by New Testament writers to indicate miracles. It may, however, be worth while to pause for a moment to ascertain the sense in which Paul, who wrote before there was a "New Testament" at all, usually employed these words. In the four Epistles of Paul the word σημεῖον occurs six times. In Rom. iv. 11 Abraham is said to have received the "sign (σημεῖον) of circumcision," in which there is nothing miraculous. In 1 Cor. i. 22 it is said: "Since both Jews require signs (σημεῖα)[1] and Greeks seek after wisdom;" and again, 1 Cor. xiv. 22: "Wherefore the tongues are for a sign (σημεῖον) not to the believing but to the unbelieving," &c. We shall have more to say regarding these passages presently, but just now we merely quote them to show the use of the word. The only other places in which it occurs[2] are those pointed out, and which are the subject of our discussion. In Rom. xv. 19 the word is used in the plural and combined with τέρας: "in the power of signs and wonders" (σημείων καὶ τεράτων); and in the second passage, 2 Cor. xii. 12, it is employed twice, "the signs (τὰ σημεῖα) of the apostle" and the second time again in combination with τέρας and δύναμις, "both in signs" (σημείοις), &c. The word τέρας is only twice met with in Paul's writings; that is to say, in Rom. xv. 19 and 2 Cor. xii. 12; and on both occasions, as we

[1] The singular σημεῖον of the authorized version must be abandoned before the almost unanimous testimony of all the older MSS.

[2] In the Epistles which bear the name of Paul it is only to be found in 2 Thess. ii. 9, iii. 17.

have just mentioned, it is combined with σημεῖον.[1] On the other hand, Paul uses δύναμις no less than 34 times,[2] and, leaving for the present out of the question the passages cited, upon every occasion, except one, perhaps, the word has the simple signification of "power." The one exception is Rom. viii. 38, where it occurs in the plural: δυνάμεις "powers," the Apostle expressing his persuasion that nothing will be able to separate us from the love of God, "nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers (δυνάμεις), nor height, nor depth," &c., &c. In 1 Cor. xiv. 11, where the authorized version renders the original: "Therefore, if I know not the meaning (δύναμιν) of the voice," it has still the same sense.

Before discussing the passages before us we must point out that there is so much doubt, at least, regarding the authenticity of the last two chapters of the Epistle to the Romans that the passage, Rom. xv. 18, 19, can scarcely be presented as evidence on such a point as the reality of miracles. We do not intend to debate the matter closely, but shall merely state a few of the facts of the case and pass on, for it would not materially affect our argument if the passage were altogether beyond suspicion. The Epistle, in our authorized text, ends with a long and somewhat involved doxology, xvi. 25-27; and we may point out here that it had already seemed to be brought to a close not only at the end of chapter xv. (33) but also at xvi. 20. The doxology, xvi. 25-27, which

[1] τέρας is only met with elsewhere in the New Testament five times: Mt. xxiv. 24, Mk. xiii. 22, John iv. 48, 2 Thess. ii. 9, Heb. ii. 4.

[2] Rom. i. 4, 16, 20, viii. 38, ix. 17, xv. 13, xv. 19 (twice), 1 Cor. i. 18, 24, ii. 4, 5, iv. 19, 20, v. 4, vi. 14, xii. 10, 28, 29, xiv. 11, xv. 24, 43, 56, 2 Cor. i. 8, iv. 7, vi. 7, viii. 3 (twice), xii. 9 (twice), 12, xiii. 4 (twice), and Gal. iii. 5.

more particularly demands our attention, is stated by Origen[1] to be placed in some MSS at the end of ch. xiv.; and a similar statement is made by Cyril, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact and others. We find these verses actually so placed in L, and in upwards of 220 out of 250 cursive MSS. of Byzantine origin, in an account of ancient MSS. in Cod. 66, in most of the Greek Lectionaries, in the Slavonic and later Syriac versions as also in the Gothic, Arabic, (in the polyglot and triglot text) and some MSS. of the Armenian. They are inserted both at the end of xiv. and at the end of the Epistle by the Alexandrian Codex,[2] one of the most ancient manuscripts extant, and by some other MSS.[3] Now, how came this doxology to be placed at all at the end of chapter xiv.? The natural inference is that it was so placed because that was the end of the Epistle. Subsequently, chapters xv. and xvi. being added, it is supposed that the closing doxology was removed from the former position and placed at the end of the appended matter. This inference is supported by the important fact that, as we learn from Origen,[4] the last two

[1] ". . . In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est, in his quæ non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput (xvi. 25—27) diverse positum invenimus. In nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum, quem supra diximus, hoc est 'omne quod non est ex fide peccatum est' (xiv. 23) statim cohærens habetur: 'ei autem, qui potens est vos confirmare' (xvi. 25—27). Alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est positum continent." Comment. ad Rom. xvi. 25. This passage is only extant in the Latin version of Rufinus.

[2] xvi. 24 is wholly omitted by the Alexandrian, Vatican, and Sinaitic codices, and also by C and some other MSS.

[3] It is unnecessary for us to state that other codices, as B, C, D, E, ℵ, and some cursive MSS., have the verses only at the end of xvi.; nor that they are omitted altogether by F, G, D ***, and by MSS. referred to by Jerome.

[4] "Caput hoc (xvi. 25—27) Marcion, a quo Scripturæ evangelicæ atque apostolicæ interpolatæ sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit. Et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo loco, ubi scriptum est: Omne autem quod non ex fide, peccatum est (xiv. 23), usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit." Comment. ad Rom. xvi. 25. We shall not discuss the difference between "abstulit" and

chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, including the doxology (xvi. 25-27) did not exist in Marcion's text, the most ancient form of it of which we have any knowledge. Tertullian, who makes no reference to these two chapters, speaks of the passage, Rom. xiv. 10, as at the close (in clausula) of the epistle,[1] and he does not call any attention to their absence from Marcion's Epistle. Is it not reasonable to suppose that they did not form part of his copy? In like manner Irenæus, who very frequently quotes from the rest of the Epistle, nowhere shows acquaintance with these chapters. The first writer who distinctly makes use of any part of them is Clement of Alexandria. It has been argued both that Marcion omitted the two chapters because they contain what was opposed to his views, and because they had no dogmatic matter to induce him to retain them; but, whilst the two explanations destroy each other, neither of them is more than a supposition to account for the absence of what, it may with equal propriety be conjectured, never formed part of his text.

The external testimony, however, does not stand alone, but is supported by very strong internal evidence. We shall only indicate one or two points, leaving those who desire to go more deeply into the discussion to refer to works more particularly concerned with it, which we shall sufficiently indicate. It is a very singular thing that Paul, who, when he wrote this epistle had never been in Rome, should be intimately acquainted with so many persons there. The fact that there was much intercourse

"dissecuit," nor the interpretation given by *Nitzsch* (Zeitschr. hist. Theol., 1860, p. 285 ff.) to the latter word. Most critics agree that Marcion altogether omitted the chapters.

[1] Adv. Marc. v. 14; *Rönsch*, Das N. T. Tertullian's, 1871, p. 349. The passages from Tertullian's writings in which reference is supposed to be made to these chapters which are quoted by *Rönsch* (p. 350) do not show any acquaintance with them.

between Rome and other countries by no means accounts for the simultaneous presence there of so many of the Apostle's personal friends. Aquila and Priscilla, who are saluted (xvi. 3), were a short time before (1 Cor. xvi. 19) in Ephesus.[1] It may, moreover, be remarked as a suggestive fact that when, according to the Acts (xxviii. 14ff.), Paul very soon afterwards arrived in Rome, most of these friends seem to have disappeared,[2] and the chief men of the Jews called together by Paul do not seem to be aware of the existence of a christian body at Rome.[3] Another point is connected with the very passage which has led to this discussion. xv. 18, 19 read: 18. "For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, in order to (εἰς) the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and deed, 19. in the power of signs and wonders (ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων) in the power of the Spirit (ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος); so that from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ;" &c. The statement that "from Jerusalem" he had "fully preached" the Gospel is scarcely in agreement with the statement in the Epistle to the Galatians i. 17-23, ii. 1ff. Moreover, there is no confirmation anywhere of the Apostle's having preached as far as Illyricum, which was then almost beyond the limits of civilization. Baur suggests that in making his ministry commence at Jerusalem, there is too evident a concession made to the Jewish Christians, according to whom every preacher of the Gospel must naturally commence his career at the holy city. It would detain us much too long to enter upon an analysis of these two

[1] The writer of 2 Tim. iv. 19 represents them as in Ephesus.

[2] *Credner*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 387; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Zeit., ii. p. 124, anm. 2.

[3] Acts xxviii. 21, 22.

chapters, and to show the repetition in them of what has already been said in the earlier part of the Epistle; the singular analogies presented with the Epistles to the Corinthians, not of the nature of uniformity of style, but of imitation; the peculiarity of the mention of a journey to Spain as the justification of a passing visit to Rome, and perhaps a further apology for even writing a letter to the Church there which another had founded; the suspicious character of the names which are mentioned in the various clauses of salutation; and to state many other still more important objections which various critics have advanced, but which would require more elaborate explanation than can possibly be given here. It will suffice for us to mention that the phenomena presented by the two chapters are so marked and curious that for a century they have largely occupied the attention of writers of all shades of opinion, and called forth very elaborate theories to acount for them; the apparent necessity for which in itself shows the insecure position of the passage. Semler,[1] without denying the Pauline authorship of the two chapters, considered they did not properly belong to the Epistle to the Romans. He supposed xvi. 3-16 to have been intended merely for the messenger who carried the Epistle, as a list of the persons to whom salutations were to be given, and to these ch. xv. was to be specially delivered. Paulus[2] considered ch. xv. to be a separate letter, addressed specially to the leaders of the Roman Church, ch. i.-xiv. being the Epistle to the community in general. The epistle then being sealed up and ready for any opportunity of transmission, but none presenting itself before

[1] Diss. de duplici apend. ep. P. ad Rom. 1767; Paraphr. epist. ad Rom., 1769, p. 290 ff.

[2] Uebers. u. Erkl. des Römer. u. Galaterbr., 1831, Einl.

his arrival in Corinth, the apostle there, upon an additional sheet, wrote xvi. and entrusted it with the letter to Phœbe. Eichhorn[1] supposed that the parchment upon which the Epistle was written was finished at xiv. 23; and, as Paul and his scribe had only a small sheet at hand, the doxology only, xvi. 25-27, was written upon the one side of it, and on the other the greetings and the apostolic benediction, xvi. 21-24, and thus the letter was completed; but, as it could not immediately be forwarded, the apostle added a fly-leaf with ch. xv. Bertholdt[2] Guericke[3] and others adopted similar views more or less modified, representing the close of the Epistle to have been formed by successive postscripts. More recently, Renan[4] has affirmed the epistle to be a circular letter addressed to churches in Rome, Ephesus, and other places, to each of which only certain portions were transmitted with appropriate salutations and endings, which have all been collected into the one Epistle in the form in which we have it. David Schulz conjectured that xvi. 1-20 was an epistle written from Rome to the church at Ephesus; and this theory was substantially adopted by Ewald,—who held that xvi. 3-20 was part of a lost epistle to Ephesus,—and by many other critics.[5] Of course the virtual authenticity of the xv.-xvi. chapters, nearly or exactly as they are, is affirmed by many writers. Baur, however, after careful investigation, pronounced the two chapters inauthentic, and in this he is followed by able critics.[6] Under all these circumstances it is obvious

[1] Einl. iii. 232 ff. [2] Einl. viii. p. 3303 ff.

[3] Gesammtgesch. N. T., p. 327 f. [4] St. Paul, 1869, p. lxiii. ff.

[5] *Schulz*, Stud. u. Krit. 1829, p. 609 ff.; *Ewald*, Sendschr. d. Paulus, p. 345, anm. p. 428 f.; *Laurent*, N. T. Stud., 1866, p. 32 f.; *Mangold*, Römerbr., 1866, p. 38, 62; *Ritschl*, Jahrb. deutsche Th., 1866, p. 352; *Reuss*, Gesch. N. T., p. 98; *Schott*, Isagoge, p. 249 ff.; *Weisse*, Philos. Dogmatik; 1855, i. p. 146.

[6] *Baur*, Tüb. Zeitschr., 1836, iii. p. 97 f.; Paulus, i. p. 393 ff.; *Lucht*,

that we need not occupy ourselves much with the passage in Rom. xv. 18, 19, but our argument will equally apply to it. In order to complete this view of the materials we may simply mention, as we pass on, that the authenticity of 2 Cor. xii. 12 has likewise been impugned by a few critics, and the verse, or at least the words σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμεσιν, as well as Rom. xv. 19, declared an interpolation.[1] This cannot, however, so far as existing evidence goes, be demonstrated; and, beyond the mere record of the fact, this conjecture does not here require further notice.

It may be well, before proceeding to the Epistles to the Corinthians, which furnish the real matter for discussion, first to deal with the passage cited from Gal. iii. 5, which is as follows:—"He then that supplieth to you the Spirit and worketh powers (δυνάμεις) within you (ἐν ὑμῖν), (doeth he it) from works of law or from hearing of faith?"[2] The authorised version reads: "and worketh miracles among you;" but this cannot be maintained, and ἐν ὑμῖν must be rendered "within you," the ἐν certainly retaining its natural signification when used with ἐνεργεῖν, the primary meaning of which is itself to in-work. The vast majority of critics of all schools agree in this view.[3] There is an evident reference to iii. 2,

Ueb. die beid. letzt. Cap. des Römerbr., 1871; *Scholten*, Theol. Tijdschr., 1876, p. 3 ff.; *Schwegler*, das nachap. Z., i. p. 296; ii. 123 ff.; *Volkmar*, Römerbr., 1875, p. xv. ff., 129 ff. Cf. *Holtzmann*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1874, p. 511 ff.; *Lipsius*, Protestanten-Bibel, 1872, p. 488, 612, 629; *Rovers*, Heeft Paulus zich op wond. beroep., 1870, p. 15 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 488. Some consider ch. xvi. alone inauthentic, as: *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 137; *Weiss*, Das Marcusevang., 1872, p. 495, anm. 1.

[1] *Matthes*, De nieuwe Richtung, 2de uitg., p. 203; *Rovers*, Heeft Paulus, &c., 1870, p. 6ff.; Theol. Tijdschr., 1870, p. 606 ff.; *Scholten*, Theol. Tijdschr., 1876, p. 25 f.; Het paul. Ev., p. 464, n. 1.

[2] ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; Gal. iii. 5.

[3] So Alford, Bisping, Ellicott, Ewald, Grotius, Hofmann, Holtzmann,

and to the reception of the Spirit, here further characterised as producing such effects within the minds of those who receive it,[1] the worker who gives the Spirit being God. The opinion most commonly held is that reference is here made to the "gifts" (*χαρίσματα*), regarding which the Apostle elsewhere speaks,[2] and which we shall presently discuss, but this is by no means certain and cannot be determined. It is equally probable that he may refer to the spiritual effect produced upon the souls of the Galatians by the Gospel which he so frequently represents as a "power" of God. In any case, it is clear that there is no external miracle referred to here, and even if allusion to Charismata be understood we have yet to ascertain precisely what these were. We shall endeavour to discover whether there was anything in the least degree miraculous in these "gifts," but there is no affirmation in this passage which demands special attention, and whatever general significance it

Lightfoot, Matthies, Meyer, Olshausen, Schott, Schrader, Usteri, de Wette, Wieseler, Wordsworth, &c., &c., in l.

[1] Olshausen, for instance, says: "Das *ἐν ὑμῖν* ist nicht zu fassen: unter euch, sondern = *ἐν καρδίαις ὑμῶν*, in dem die Geisteswirkung als eine innerliche gedacht ist." Bibl. Comm., iv. p. 58.

[2] Dr. Lightfoot says on the words "*ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν*] Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 10, *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων* (with vv. 28, 29), Matth. xiv. 2, *αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ* (comp. Mark vi. 14). These passages favour the sense 'worketh miraculous powers *in* you,' rather than 'worketh miracles *among* you;' and this meaning also accords better with the context: comp. 1 Cor. xii. 6, *ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν*. What was the exact nature of these 'powers,' whether they were exerted over the physical or the moral world, it is impossible to determine. The limitations implied in 1 Cor. xii. 10, and the general use of *δυνάμεις* point rather to the former. It is important to notice how here, as in the Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul assumes the possession of these extraordinary powers by his converts as an acknowledged fact." Ep. to the Gal. p. 135. Cf. *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., St. Paul's Epistles, p. 57, and especially p. 128, where, on 1 Cor. xii. 11, Dr. Wordsworth notes: "*ἐνεργεῖ*] *in-worketh*," and quotes Cyril, ". . . . and the Holy Spirit *works in* every member of Christ's body," &c.

may have will be met when considering the others which are indicated.

The first passage in the Epistles to the Corinthians, which is pointed out as containing the testimony of Paul both to the reality of miracles in general and to the fact that he himself performed them, is the following, 2 Cor. xii. 12: "Truly the signs (*σημεῖα*) of the Apostle were wrought in you (*κατειργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν*) in all patience, both in signs and wonders and powers (*σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμεσιν*)."[1] We have to justify two departures in this rendering from that generally received. The first of these is the adoption of "wrought in you," instead of "wrought among you;" and the second the simple use of "powers" for *δυνάμεις*, instead of "mighty works." We shall take the second first. We have referred to every passage except 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29, in which Paul makes use of the word *δυνάμεις*, and fortunately they are sufficiently numerous to afford us a good insight into his practice. It need not be said that the natural sense of *δυνάμεις* is in no case "mighty works" or miracles, and that such an application of the Greek word is peculiar to the New Testament and, subsequently, to Patristic literature. There is, however, no ground for attributing this use of the word to Paul. It is not so used in the Septuagint, and it is quite evident that the Apostle does not employ it to express external effects or works, but spiritual phenomena or potentiality. In the passage, Gal. iii. 5, which we have just discussed, where the word occurs in the plural, as here, it is understood to express "powers." We may quote the rendering of that passage by the Bishop of Gloucester:

[1] *τὰ μὲν σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου κατειργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ, σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμεσιν.* 2 Cor. xii. 12.

"He then, *I say*, that ministereth to you the Spirit and worketh *mighty* powers within you, *doeth he it* by the works of the law or by the report of faith?"[1] Why "mighty" should be inserted it is difficult to understand, but the word is rightly printed in italics to show that it is not actually expressed in the Greek. "What was the exact nature of these 'powers' . . . it is impossible to determine," observes another scholar quoted above,[2] on the same passage.[3] In 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29, where the plural δυνάμεις again occurs, the intention to express "powers"[4] and not external results—miracles—is perfectly clear, the word being in the last two verses used alone to represent the "gifts." In all of these passages the word is the representative of the "powers" and not of the "effects."[5] This interpretation is rendered more clear by, and at the same time confirms, the preceding phrase, "were wrought in you" (κατειργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν). 'Powers' (δυνάμεις), as in Gal. iii. 5, are worked "within you," and the rendering of that passage being so settled, it becomes authoritative for this. If, however, direct confirmation of Paul's meaning be required we have it in Rom. vii. 8, where we find the same verb used with ἐν in this sense: "But sin . . . . wrought in me (κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ) all manner of coveting," &c.; and with this may also be compared 2 Cor. vii. 11 . . . . "what earnestness it wrought in you" (κατειργάσατο ἐν[6]

[1] *Ellicott*, St. Paul's Ep. to the Galatians, 4th ed., 1867, p. 154 f.

[2] Dr. Lightfoot, see note 2, p. 337.

[3] It is rendered "vertues" in Wyclif's version.

[4] "δυνάμεις] *powers*. From *persons* he passes to *things*," &c. *Wordsworth*, on 1 Cor. xii. 28, Gk. Test., St. Paul's Epistles, p. 129.

[5] Grotius renders δυνάμεσιν=virtutibus ad 2 Cor. xii. 12. Annot. in N. T., vi. 539.

[6] ἐν is founded in C, F, G, and other MSS., although it is omitted in the other great codices. This, however, does not affect the argument.

ὑμῖν). It was thus Paul's habit to speak of spiritual effects wrought "within," and as he referred to the "powers" (δυνάμεις) worked "within" the souls of the Galatians, so he speaks of them here as "wrought in" the Corinthians. It will become clear as we proceed that the addition to δυνάμεις of "signs and wonders" does not in the least affect this interpretation. In 1 Cor. xiv. 22, the Apostle speaks of the gift of "tongues" as "a sign" (σημεῖον).

Upon the supposition that Paul was affirming the actual performance of miracles by himself, how extraordinary becomes the statement that they "were wrought in all patience," for it is manifest that "in all patience" (ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ) does not form part of the signs, as some have argued, but must be joined to the verb (κατειργάσθη).[1] It may be instructive to quote a few words of Olshausen upon the point:—"The ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ is not altogether easy. It certainly cannot be doubtful that it is to be joined to κατειργάσθη and not to what follows; but for what reason does Paul here make it directly prominent that he wrought his signs in all patience? It seems to me probable that in this there may be a reproof to the Corinthians, who, in spite of such signs, still showed themselves wavering regarding the authority of the Apostle. In such a position, Paul would say, he had, patiently waiting, allowed his light to shine amongst them, certain of ultimate triumph."[2] This will scarcely be accepted by any one as a satisfactory solution of the difficulty, which is a real one if it be assumed that Paul, claiming to have performed mira-

[1] So Alford, Billroth, Ewald, Maier, Meyer, Neander, Olshausen, Osiander, De Wette, &c., &c., l. c.

[2] *Olshausen*, Bibl. Com., iii. p. 879 f.

cles, wrought them "in all patience." Besides the matter is complicated, and the claim to have himself performed a miracle still more completely vanishes, when we consider the fact that the passive construction of the sentence does not actually represent Paul as the active agent by whom the signs were wrought. "Truly the signs of the apostle were wrought," but how wrought? Clearly he means by the Spirit, as he distinctly states to the Galatians. To them "Jesus Christ (the Messiah) was fully set forth crucified," and he asks them: Was it from works of the Law or from hearing in faith the Gospel thus preached to them that they "received the Spirit"? and that he who supplies the Spirit "and worketh powers" in them does so? From faith, of course.[1] The meaning of Paul, therefore, was this: His Gospel was preached among them "in all patience," which being received by the hearing of faith, the Spirit was given to them, and the signs of the apostle were thus wrought among them. The representation is made throughout the Acts that the apostles lay their hands on those who believe, and they receive the Holy Spirit and speak with tongues. If any special "sign of the apostle" can be indicated at all, it is this; and in illustration we may point to one statement made in the Acts. Philip, the evangelist, who was not an apostle, is represented as going into Samaria and preaching the Messiah to the Samaritans, who give heed to the things spoken by him, and multitudes are baptized (viii. 5, 6, 12), but there was not the outpouring of the Holy Spirit which usually accompanied the apostolic baptism. "And the Apostles in Jerusalem, having heard that Samaria had received the word of God, sent unto them Peter and John; who

[1] Gal. iii. 1 ff.

when they came down prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit—for as yet he had fallen upon none of them, but they had only been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they (the Apostles) their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit."[1] We may further refer to the episode at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1 ff.) where Paul finds certain disciples who, having only been baptized into John's baptism, had not received the Holy Spirit, nor even heard whether there was a Holy Spirit. (xix. 6.) "And Paul having laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they were speaking with tongues and prophesying."

When we examine Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians we find ample assurance that the interpretation here given of this passage is correct, and that he does not refer, as apologists have maintained, to miracles wrought by himself, but to the Charismata, which were supposed to have been bestowed upon the Corinthians who believed, and which thus were the signs of his apostleship. The very next verse to that which is before us shows this: "Truly the signs of the Apostle were wrought in you in all patience .... 13. For (γάρ) what is there wherein ye were inferior to the other Churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you?" The mere performance of signs and wonders did not constitute their equality; but in the possession of the Charismata,—regarding which so much is said in the first epistle, and which were the result of his preaching,—they were not inferior to the other Churches, and only inferior, Paul says with his fine irony, in not having, like the other Churches with their apostles, been called upon to acquire the merit of

[1] Acts viii. 14—17.

bearing his charges. What could be more distinct than the Apostle's opening address in the first Epistle: "I thank my God always, on your behalf, for the grace of God which was given you in Christ Jesus; that in everything ye were enriched by him (at the time of their conversion[1]), in all utterance and in all knowlege: even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you: *so that ye come behind in no gift* (χαρίσματι)," &c. For this reason they were not inferior to the other Churches, and those were the signs of the Apostle which were wrought in them. Paul very distinctly declares the nature of his ministry amongst the Corinthians and the absence of other "signs": 1 Cor. i. 22 f. "Since both Jews demand signs (σημεῖα) and Greeks seek after wisdom, but *we* (ἡμεῖς δὲ) preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling-block and unto Gentiles foolishness, but unto those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power (δύναμιν) of God and the wisdom of God." The contrast is here clearly drawn between the requirement of Jews (signs) and of Greeks (wisdom) and Paul's actual ministry: no signs, but a scandal (σκάνδαλον) to the Jew, and no wisdom, but foolishness to the Greek, but this word of the cross (λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ) "to us who are being saved is the power (δύναμις) of God" (i. 18).[2] The Apostle tells us what he considers the "sign of the Apostle," when, more directly defending himself against the opponents who evidently denied his apostolic claims, he says vehemently: 1 Cor. ix. 1 ff. "Am I not free? Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord? *are not ye my work in the Lord?* If I be not an Apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you: *for the seal*

[1] *Stanley*, Eps. to the Cor. p. 23.
[2] And again Rom. i. 16, &c., &c.

(σφραγίς) *of my Apostleship are ye in the Lord.*" [1] It cannot, we think, be doubted, when the passage, 2 Cor. xii. 12, is attentively considered, that Paul does not refer to external miracles performed by him, but to the Charismata which he supposed to be conferred upon the Corinthian Christians on their acceptance of the Gospel which the Apostle preached. These Charismata, however, are advanced as miraculous, and the passages 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29 are quoted in support of the statement we are discussing, and these now demand our attention.

It may be well at once to give the verses which are referred to, and in which it is said that Paul "goes somewhat elaborately into the exact place in the Christian economy that is to be assigned to the working of miracles and gifts of healing" (1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29). It is necessary for the full comprehension of the case that we should quote the context: xii. 4. "Now there are diversities of gifts (χαρισμάτων), but the same Spirit; 5. and there are diversities of ministries (διακονιῶν), and the same Lord; 6. and there are diversities of workings (ἐνεργημάτων), but it is the same God who worketh the all in all (ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν): 7. But to each is given the manifestation of the Spirit (φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος) for profit; 8. For to one is given by the Spirit a word of wisdom (λόγος σοφίας); to another a word of knowledge (λόγος γνώσεως) according to the same Spirit; 9. to another faith (πίστις) in the same Spirit, to another gifts of healings (χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων) in the one Spirit; 10. to another (inward) workings of powers (ἐνεργήματα

[1] Comp. Rom. iv. 11, "and he (Abraham) received a sign (σημεῖον) of circumcision, a seal (σφραγῖδα) of the righteousness of the faith," &c., &c.

δυνάμεων); to another prophecy (προφητεία); to another discerning of spirits (διάκρισις πνευμάτων); to another kinds of tongues (γένη γλωσσῶν); to another interpretation of tongues (ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν); 11. but all these worketh (ἐνεργεῖ) the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each severally as he wills." After illustrating this by showing the mutual dependence of the different members and senses of the body, the Apostle proceeds: v. 28. "And God set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that powers (δυνάμεις), after that gifts of healings (χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων), helpings (ἀντιλήψεις), governings (κυβερνήσεις), kinds of tongues (γένη γλωσσῶν). 29. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all powers (δυνάμεις)? 30. have all gifts of healings (χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων)? do all speak with tongues (γλώσσαις λαλοῦσιν)? do all interpret (διερμηνεύουσιν)?"

Before we commence an examination of this interesting and important passage, it is essential that we should endeavour to disabuse our minds of preconceived ideas. Commentators are too prone to apply to the Apostle's remarks a system of interpretation based upon statements made by later and less informed writers, and warped by belief in the reality of a miraculous element pervading all apostolic times, which have been derived mainly from post-apostolic narratives. What do we really know of the phenomena supposed to have characterized the Apostolic age, and which were later, and are now, described as miraculous? With the exception of what we glean from the writings of Paul, we know absolutely nothing from any contemporary writer and eye-witness. In the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles, we have detailed accounts of many miracles said

to have been performed by the Apostles and others; but these narratives were all written at a much later period, and by persons who are unknown, and most of whom are not even affirmed to have been eye-witnesses.[1] In the Acts of the Apostles we have an account of some of the very Charismata referred to by Paul in the passage above quoted, and we shall thus have the advantage of presently comparing the two accounts. We must, however, altogether resist any attempt to insert between the lines of the Apostle's writing ideas and explanations derived from the Author of the Acts and from patristic literature, and endeavour to understand what it is he himself says and intends to say. It must not be supposed that we in the slightest degree question the fact that the Apostle Paul believed in the reality of supernatural intervention in mundane affairs, or that he asserted the actual occurrence of certain miracles. Our desire is as far as possible to ascertain what Paul himself has to say upon specific phenomena, now generally explained as miraculous, and thus, descending from vague generalities to more distinct statements, to ascertain the value of his opinion regarding the character of such phenomena. It cannot fail to be instructive to determine something of the nature of Charismata from an eye-witness who believed them to have been supernatural. His account, as we have seen, is the most precious evidence of the Church to the reality of the miraculous.

The first point which must be observed in connection with the Charismata referred to by Paul in the passage before us is that, whilst there are diversities amongst them, all the phenomena described are ascribed to

[1] It is suggestive that the curious passage Mk. xvi. 17—18 is not even by the author of the second Gospel, but a later addition.

"one and the same Spirit dividing to each severally as he wills;" and, consequently, that, although there may be differences in their form and value, a supernatural origin is equally assigned to all the "gifts" enumerated. What then are these Charismata? "A word of wisdom," "a word of knowledge," and "faith" are the first three mentioned. What the precise difference was, in Paul's meaning, between the utterance of wisdom (σοφία) and of knowledge (γνῶσις) it is impossible now with certainty to say, nor is it very essential for us to inquire. The two words are combined in Rom. xi. 33: "O the depths of the riches and wisdom (σοφίας) and knowledge (γνώσεως) of God!" and in this very epistle some varying use is made of both words. Paul tells the Corinthians (1, i. 17) that Christ did not send him "in wisdom of word" (οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου) or utterance: and (ii. 1) "not with excellency of word or wisdom" (λόγου ἢ σοφίας, cf. ii. 4); and further on he says (i. 30) that Christ Jesus "was made unto us wisdom (σοφία) from God." The most suggestive expressions,[1] however, are the following, we think: 1 Cor. ii. 6. "But we speak wisdom (σοφίαν) among the perfect, yet not the wisdom (σοφίαν) of this age, nor of the rulers of this age, that come to nought, 7. but we speak God's wisdom (θεοῦ σοφίαν) in mystery, the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the ages unto our glory, 8. which none of the rulers of this age has known, for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory. 9. But as it is written, 'What eye saw not,' &c. &c. 10. But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit. . . . . 11. . . .

[1] The word is used in the following passages of Paul's four Epistles: Rom. xi. 33; 1 Cor. i. 17, 19, 20, 21 twice, 22, 24, 30, ii. 1, 4, 5, 6 twice, 7, 13, iii. 19, xii. 8; 2 Cor. i. 12.

even so also the things of God knoweth no one but the Spirit of God. 12. But we received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is from God, that we might know the things that are freely given us by God; 13. which things also we speak, not in words taught by human wisdom, but in words taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual things to the spiritual"[1] (*πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες*). It is quite clear from all the antecedent context that Paul's preaching was specially the Messiah crucified, "Christ the power of God and the wisdom (*σοφίαν*) of God," and we may conclude reasonably that the *λόγος σοφίας* of our passage was simply the eloquent utterance of this doctrine. In like manner, we may get some insight into the meaning which Paul attached to the word "knowledge" (*γνῶσις*). It will be remembered that at the very opening of the first Epistle to the Corinthians Paul expresses his thankfulness that in everything they were enriched in Christ Jesus: i. 5. "in all utterance (*λόγῳ*) and in all knowledge (*γνώσει*), 6. even as the testimony of the Christ was confirmed in you;" that is say, according to commentators, by these very Charismata. Later, speaking of "tongues," he says (1 Cor. xiv. 6): ". . . What shall I profit you, except I shall speak to you either in revelation or in knowledge (*ἐν γνώσει*), or in prophecy, or in teaching?" We obtain a clearer insight into his meaning in the second Epistle, in the passage 2 Cor. ii. 14-16, and still more in iv. 3-6 and x. 5, where he describes metaphorically his weapons as not carnal, but strong through God, "casting down reasonings and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into cap-

[1] There is considerable room for doubt as to the real sense of this last phrase.

tivity every thought to the obedience of the Christ;" and if we ventured to offer an opinion, it would be that Paul means by λόγος γνώσεως simply Christian theology. We merely offer this as a passing suggestion. Little need be said with regard to the gift of "faith" (πίστις), which is perfectly intelligible. Apologists argue that by these three "gifts" some supernatural form of wisdom, knowledge, and faith is expressed, and we shall have something more to say on the point presently; but here we merely point out that there is no ground whatever for such an assertion except the fact that the Apostle ascribes to them a supernatural origin, or, in fact, believes in the inspiration of such qualities. All that can be maintained is that Paul accounts for the possession of characteristics, which we now know to be natural, by asserting that they are the direct gift of the Holy Spirit. There is not the faintest evidence to show that these natural capabilities did not antecedently exist in the Corinthians, and were not merely stimulated into action in Christian channels by the religious enthusiasm and zeal accompanying their conversion; but, on the contrary, every reason to believe this to be the case, as we shall further see.[1] In fact, according to the Apostolic Church, every quality was a supernatural gift, and all ability or excellence in practical life directly emanated from the action of the Holy Spirit.

We may now proceed to "gifts of healings" (χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων)[2] which it will be noted are doubly in the plural, indicating, as is supposed, a variety of special gifts, each

[1] We may here say that attempts have been made to show that the Apostle classifies the charismata in groups of threes, and even sets forth the three persons of the Trinity as the several donors. It would be useless for us to touch upon the point.

[2] The word ἴαμα only occurs in the N. T. in 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29. It might better be rendered "means of healing," or "remedies."

having reference probably to special diseases. What is there to show that there was anything more miraculous in "gifts of healings" than in the possession of an utterance of wisdom, an utterance of knowledge, or faith? Nothing whatever. On the contrary, everything, from the unvarying experience of the world, to the inferences which we shall be able to draw from the whole of this information regarding the Charismata, shows that there was no miraculous power of healing either possessed or exercised. Reference is frequently made to the passage in the so-called Epistle of James as an illustration of this, v. 14: 'Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, having anointed him with oil in the name of the Lord: 15. And the prayer of faith shall save the afflicted, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him." The context, however, not only shows that in this there is no allusion to any gift of healing or miraculous power, but seems to ignore the existence of any such gift. The epistle continues: v. 16. "Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray for one another that ye may be healed. The supplication of a righteous man availeth much when it is working." And then the successful instance of the prayer of Elijah that it might not rain and again that it might rain is given. The passage is merely an assertion of the efficacy of prayer, and if, as is not unfrequently done, it be argued that the gifts of healings were probably applied by means of earnest prayer for the sick, it may be said that this is the only "gift" which is supposed to have descended to our times. It does not require much argument, however, to show that the reality of a miraculous gift can scarcely be demonstrated by appealing to the objective efficacy of prayer. We may,

in passing, refer apologists who hold the authenticity of the Epistles to the Philippians and to Timothy, to indications which do not quite confirm the supposition that a power of miraculous healing actually existed in the Apostolic Church. In the Epistle to the Philippians, ii. 25 ff., Paul is represented as sending Epaphroditus to them (v. 26) "Since he was longing after you all and was distressed because ye heard that he was sick. 27. For, indeed, he was sick nigh unto death; but God had mercy on him; and not on him only, but on me also, that I might not have sorrow upon sorrow. I sent him, therefore, the more anxiously, that, when ye see him, ye may rejoice again, and that I may be the less sorrowful." The anxiety felt by the Philippians, and the whole language of the writer, in this passage, are rather inconsistent with the knowledge that miraculous power of healing was possessed by the Church, and of course by Paul, which would naturally have been exerted for one in whom so many were keenly interested. Then, in 2 Tim. iv. 20, the writer says: "Trophimus I left at Miletus sick." If miraculous powers of healing existed, why were they not exerted in this case? If they were exerted and failed for special reasons, why are these not mentioned? It is unfortunate that there is so little evidence of the application of these gifts. On the other hand, we may suggest that medical art scarcely existed at that period in such communities, and that the remedies practised admirably lent themselves to the theory of "gifts" of healings, rather than to any recognition of the fact that the accurate diagnosis of disease and successful treatment of it can only be the result of special study and experience.

The next gift mentioned is (v. 10) "workings of powers"

(ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων) very unwarrantably rendered in our "authorized" version "the working of miracles." We have already said enough regarding Paul's use of δύναμις. The phrase before us would be even better rendered in- or inward-workings of powers[1] and the use made of ἐνεργεῖν by Paul throughout his epistles would confirm this. It may be pointed out that as the gifts just referred to are for "healings" it is difficult to imagine any class of "miracles" which could well be classed under a separate head as the special "working of miracles" contemplated by apologists. Infinitely the greater number of miracles related in the Gospels and Acts are "healings" of disease. Is it possible to suppose that Paul really indicated by this expression a distinct order of "miracles" properly so called? Certainly not. Neither the words themselves used by Paul, properly understood, nor the context permit us to suppose that he referred to the working of miracles at all. We have no intention of conjecturing what these "powers" were supposed to be; it is sufficient that we show they cannot rightly be exaggerated into an assertion of the power of working miracles. It is much more probable that, in the expression, no external working by the gifted person is implied at all, and that the gift referred to "in-workings of powers" within his own mind producing the ecstatic state with its usual manifestations or those visions and supposed revelations to which Paul himself was subject. Demonaics, or persons supposed to be possessed of evil spirits, were called ἐνεργούμενοι, and it is easy to conceive how anyone under strong religious

[1] The Bishop of Lincoln has on 1 Cor. xii. 6, "ἐνεργημάτων] *in-wrought works*. Ἐνέργημα is more than ἔργον. For ἐνέργημα is not every work, it is an *in-wrought* work," &c. On v. 11: "ἐνεργεῖ] *in-worketh*;" and on v. 28: "δυνάμεις] *powers*." Greek Test. St. Paul's Eps., p. 127 ff.

impressions, at that epoch of most intense religious emotion, might, when convulsed by nervous or mental excitement, be supposed the subject of inward workings of powers supernaturally imparted. Every period of religious zeal has been marked by such phenomena.[1] These conclusions are further corroborated by the next gifts enumerated. The first of these is "prophecy" (προφητεία), by which is not intended the mere foretelling of events, but speaking "unto men edification and exhortation and comfort," as the Apostle himself says (xiv. 3); and an illustration of this may be pointed out in Acts iv. 36, where the name Barnabas = "Son of prophecy," being interpreted is said to be "Son of Exhortation" (υἱὸς παρακλήσεως). To this follows the "discerning (or judging) of spirits" (διάκρισις πνευμάτων), a gift which, if we are to judge by Paul's expressions elsewhere, was simply the exercise of natural intelligence and discernment. In an earlier part of the first Epistle, rebuking the Corinthians for carrying their disputes before legal tribunals, he says, vi. 5: "Is it so that there is not even one wise man among you who shall be able to discern (διακρῖναι) between his brethren?" Again, in xi. 31, "But if we discerned (διεκρίνομεν) we should not be judged (ἐκρινόμεθα)" (cf vv. 28, 29), and in xiv. 29, "Let Prophets speak two or three, and let the others discern (διακρινέτωσαν).

We reserve the "kinds of tongues" and "interpretation of tongues" for separate treatment, and proceed to vv. 28ff. in which, after illustrating his meaning by the analogy of the body, the Apostle resumes his

[1] We may point out further instances of the use of ἐνεργεῖν ἐν in the New Testament, in addition to those already referred to, and which should be examined: Ephes. i. 20, ii. 2, iii. 20; Phil. ii. 13; Col. i. 29; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 7.

observations upon the Charismata, and it is instructive to consider the rank he ascribes to the various gifts. He classes them: "First, apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that powers, after that gifts of healings, helpings, governings, kinds of tongues." These so-called miraculous gifts are here placed in a lower class than those of exhortation and teaching, which is suggestive; for it is difficult to suppose that even a man like Paul could have regarded the possession of such palpable and stupendous power as the instantaneous and miraculous healing of disease, or the performance of other miracles, below the gift of teaching or exhortation. It is perfectly intelligible that the practice of medicine as it was then understood, and the skill which might have been attained in particular branches of disease by individuals, not to speak of those who may have been supposed to be performing miracles when they dealt with cases of hysteria or mental excitement, might appear to the apostle much inferior to a gift for imparting spiritual instruction and admonition; but the actual possession of supernatural power, the actual exercise of what was believed to be the personal attribute of God, must have been considered a distinction more awful and elevated than any gift of teaching. It will be noticed also that other Charismata are here introduced, whilst "discerning of spirits" is omitted. The new gifts, "helpings" and "governings," have as little a miraculous character about them as any that have preceded them. Is it not obvious that all special ability, all official capacity, is simply represented as a divine gift, and regarded as a "manifestation of the Spirit?"

It is important in the highest degree to remember that the supposed miraculous Charismata are not merely conferred upon a few persons, but are bestowed upon all

the members of the Apostolic Church.[1] "The extraordinary Charismata which the Apostles conferred through their imposition of hands," writes Dr. von Döllinger, "were so diffused and distributed, that nearly every one, or at any rate many, temporarily at least, had a share in one gift or another. This was a solitary case in history, which has never since repeated itself, and which, in default of experience, we can only approximately picture to ourselves. One might say: the metal of the Church was still glowing, molten, formless, and presented altogether another aspect than, since then, in the condition of the cold and hardened casting."[2] The apologetic representation of the case is certainly unique in history, and in its departure from all experience might, one might have thought, have excited suspicion. Difficult as it is to picture such a state, it is worth while to endeavour to do so to a small extent. Let us imagine communities of Christians, often of considerable importance, in all the larger cities as well as in smaller towns, all or most of the members of which were endowed with supernatural

[1] Cf. Eph. iv. 7, 11; 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11. Dean Stanley says: "It is important to observe, that these multiplied allusions imply a state of things in the Apostolic age, which has certainly not been seen since. On particular occasions, indeed, both in the first four centuries, and afterwards in the middle ages, miracles are ascribed by contemporary writers to the influence of the relics of particular individuals; but there has been no occasion when they have been so emphatically ascribed to whole societies, so closely mixed up with the ordinary course of life. It is not maintained that every member of the Corinthian Church had all or the greater part of these gifts, but it certainly appears that every one had some gift; and this being the case, we are enabled to realise the total difference of the organization of the Apostolic Church from any through which it has passed in its later stages. It was still in a state of fusion. Every part of the new Society was instinct with a life of its own. The whole atmosphere which it breathed must have confirmed the belief in the importance and novelty of the crisis." The Epistles of St. P. to the Corinthians, 4th ed., p. 224.

[2] Christenthum und Kirche, 2te aufl., 1868, p. 298.

gifts, and, amongst others, with power to heal diseases and to perform miracles; all the intellectual and religious qualities requisite for the guidance, edification, and government of the communities supplied abundantly and specially by the Holy Spirit; the ordinary dependence of society on the natural capacity and power of its leaders dispensed with, and every possible branch of moral culture and physical comfort provided with inspired and miraculously-gifted ministries; the utterance of wisdom and knowledge, exhortation and teaching, workings of healings, discernment of spirits, helpings, governings, kinds of tongues supernaturally diffused throughout the community by God himself. As a general rule, communities have to do as well as they can without such help, and eloquent instructors and able administrators do not generally fail them. The question, therefore, intrudes itself: Why were ordinary and natural means so completely set aside, and the qualifications which are generally found adequate for the conduct and regulation of life supplanted by divine Charismata? At least, we may suppose that communities endowed with such supernatural advantages, and guided by the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, must have been distinguished in every way from the rest of humanity, and must have presented a spectacle of the noblest life, free from the weakness and inconsistency of the world, and betraying none of the moral and intellectual frailties of ordinary society. At the very least, and without exaggeration, communities in every member of which there existed some supernatural manifestation of the Holy Spirit might be expected to show very marked superiority and nobility of character.

When we examine the Epistles of Paul and other ancient documents, we find anything but supernatural

qualities in the Churches supposed to be endowed with such miraculous gifts. On the contrary, it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the intensely human character of the conduct of such communities, their fickleness, the weakness of their fidelity to the Gospel of Paul, their wavering faith, and the ease and rapidity with which they are led astray, their petty strifes and discords, their party spirit, their almost indecent abuse of some of their supposed gifts, such as "tongues," for which Paul rebukes them so severely. The very Epistles, in fact, in which we read of the supernatural endowments and organization of the Church, are full of evidence that there was nothing supernatural in them. The primary cause apparently for which the first letter was written to the Corinthians was the occurrence of divisions and contentions amongst them (i. 10 ff.), parties of Paul, of Apollos, of Cephas, of Christ, which make the Apostle give thanks (i. 14) that he had baptized but few of them, that no one might say that they were baptized into his name. Paul had not been able to speak to them as spiritual but as carnal, mere babes in Christ (iii. 1 f.); he fed them with milk, not meat, for they were not yet able, "nor even now are ye able," he says, "for ye are yet carnal. For whereas there is among you envying and strife; are ye not carnal?" He continues in the same strain throughout the letter, admonishing them in no flattering terms. Speaking of his sending Timothy to them, he says (iv. 18 f.): "But some of you were puffed up, as though I were not coming to you; but I will come to you shortly, if it be the Lord's will, and will know, not the speech of them who are puffed up, but the power." There is serious sin amongst them, which they show no readiness to purge

away. Moreover these Corinthians have lawsuits with each other (vi. 1 ff.), and, instead of taking advantage of those supernatural Charismata, they actually take their causes for decision before the uninspired tribunals of the heathen rather than submit them to the judgment of the saints. Their own members, who have gifts of wisdom and of knowledge, discerning of spirits and governings, have apparently so little light to throw upon the regulation of social life, that the Apostle has to enter into minute details for their admonition and guidance. He has even to lay down rules regarding the head-dresses of women in the Churches (xi. 3 ff.). Even in their very Church assemblies there are divisions of a serious character amongst them (xi. 18 ff.). They misconduct themselves in the celebration of the Lord's supper, for they make it, as it were, their own supper, "and one is hungry and another is drunken." "What!" he indignantly exclaims, "have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God?" To the Galatians Paul writes, marvelling that they are so soon removing from him that called them in the grace of Christ unto a different Gospel (i. 6). "O foolish Galatians," he says (iii. 1), "who bewitched you?" In that community also, opposition to Paul and denial of his authority had become powerful. If we turn to other ancient documents, the Epistles to the seven Churches do not present us with a picture of supernatural perfection in those communities, though doubtless, like the rest, they had received these gifts. The other Epistles of the New Testament depict a state of things which by no means denotes any extraordinary or abnormal condition of the members. We may quote a short passage to show that we do not strain this representation unduly. "But certainly," says Dr

von Döllinger, "in spite of a rich outpouring of spiritual gifts vouchsafed to it, a community could fall into wanton error. Paul had in Corinth, contemporaneously with his description of the charismatic state of the church there, to denounce sad abuses. In the Galatian community, Judaistic seduction, and the darkening of Christian doctrine through the delusion as to the necessity of the observance of the law, had so much increased that the Apostle called them fools and senseless, but at the same time he appealed to the proof which was presented by the spiritual gifts and miraculous powers, in which they had participated not through the observance of the law, but through faith in Christ (Gal. iii. 2, 5). Now at that time the Charismata of teaching and knowledge must already have been weakened or extinguished in these communities, otherwise so strong an aberration would not be explicable. Nowhere, however, in this Epistle is there any trace of an established ministry; on the contrary, at the close, the 'spiritual' among them are instructed to administer the office of commination. But, generally, from that time forward, the charismatic state in the Church more and more disappeared, though single Charisma, and individuals endowed with the same, remained. In the first Epistle to the believers in Thessalonica, Paul had made it specially prominent that his Gospel had worked there, not as mere word, but with demonstration of the power of the Holy Spirit (i. 5). In the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians, there is no longer the slightest intimation of, or reference to, the Charismata, although in both communities the occasion for such an allusion was very appropriate—in Philippi through the Jewish opponents, and in Colossæ on account of the heretical dangers and

the threatening Gnostic asceticism. On the other hand, in the Epistle to the Philippians, bishops and deacons are already mentioned as ministers of the community. Then, in the Pastoral Epistles, not only is there no mention of the Charismata, but a state of the community is set forth which is wholly different from the charismatic. The communities in Asia Minor, the Ephesian first of all, are partly threatened, partly unsettled by Gnostic heresies, strifes of words, foolish controversies, empty babbling about matters of faith, of doctrines of demons, of an advancing godlessness corroding like a gangrene (1 Tim. iv. 1-3, vi. 3 ff. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 14 ff.). All the counsels which are here given to Timothy, the conduct in regard to these evils which is recommended to him, all is of a nature as though Charismata no longer existed to any extent, as though, in lieu of the first spiritual soaring and of the fulness of extraordinary powers manifesting itself in the community, the bare prose of the life of the Church had already set in." [1] Regarding this it is not necessary for us to say more than that the representation which is everywhere made, in the Acts and elsewhere, and which seems to be confirmed by Paul, is that all the members of these Christian communities received the Holy Spirit, and the divine Charismata, but that nowhere have we evidence of any supernatural results produced by them. If, however, the view above expressed be accepted, the difficulty is increased; for, except in the allusions of the Apostle to Charismata, it is impossible to discover any difference between communities which had received miraculous spiritual "gifts" and those which had not done so. On the contrary, it might possibly be shown that a church which had not

[1] Christenthum u. Kirche, 1868, p. 300 f.

been so endowed, perhaps on the whole exhibited higher spiritual qualities than another which was supposed to possess the Charismata. In none are we able to perceive any supernatural characteristics, or more than the very ordinary marks of a new religious life. It seems scarcely necessary to depart from the natural order of nature, and introduce the supernatural working of a Holy Spirit to produce such common-place results. We venture to say that there is nothing whatever to justify the assertion of supernatural agency here, and that the special divine Charismata existed only in the pious imagination of the Apostle, who referred every good quality in man to divine grace.

We have reserved the gift of "Tongues" for special discussion because Paul enters into it with a fulness with which he does not treat any of the other Charismata, and a valuable opportunity is thus afforded us of ascertaining something definite with regard to the nature of the gift; and also because we have a narrative in the Acts of the Apostles of the first descent of the Holy Spirit, manifesting itself in "Tongues," with which it may be instructive to compare the Apostle's remarks. We may mention that, in the opinion of many, the cause which induced the Apostle to say so much regarding Charismata in his first letter to the Corinthians was the circumstance, that many maintained the gift of tongues to be the only form of "the manifestation of the Spirit." This view is certainly favoured by the narrative in the Acts, in which not only at the first famous day of Pentecost, but on almost every occasion of the imposition of the Apostle's hands, this is the only gift mentioned as accompanying the reception of the Holy Spirit. In any case, it is apparent from the whole of the

Apostle's homily on the subject, that the gift of tongues was especially valued in the Church of Corinth.[1] It is difficult to conceive, on the supposition that amongst the Charismata there were comprised miraculous gifts of healings, and further power of working miracles, that these could have been held so cheap in comparison with the gift of Tongues; but in any case, a better comprehension of what this "gift" really was cannot fail to assist us in understanding the true nature of the whole of the Charismata. It is evident that the Apostle Paul himself does not rank the gift of tongues very highly, and indeed, that he seems to value prophecy more than all the other Charismata (xiv. 1 ff.); but the simple yet truly noble eloquence with which (xiii. 1 ff.) he elevates above all these gifts the possesion of spiritual love is a subtle indication of their real character. Probably Paul would have termed christian Charity a gift of the Spirit as much as he does "gifts of healings" or "workings of powers;"

[1] Dean Stanley says: "It may easily be conceived that this new life was liable to much confusion and excitement, especially in a society where the principle of moral stability was not developed commensurably with it. Such was, we know, the state of Corinth. They had, on the one hand, been 'in everything enriched by Christ, in all utterance, and in all knowledge,' 'coming behind in no gift' (i. 5, 6, 7); but, on the other hand, the same contentious spirit which had turned the most sacred names into party watchwords, and profaned the celebration of the Supper of the Lord, was ready to avail itself of the openings for vanity and ambition afforded by the distinctions of the different gifts. Accordingly, various disorders arose; every one thought of himself, and no one of his neighbour's good; and, as a natural consequence, those gifts were most highly honoured, not which were moft useful, but which were most astonishing. Amongst these the gift of tongues rose pre-eminent, as being in itself the most expressive of the new spiritual life; the very words, 'spiritual gifts,' 'spiritual man' (πνευματικά, xiv. 1; πνευματικός, xiv. 37), seem, in common parlance, to have been exclusively appropriated to it; and the other gifts, especially that of prophecy, were despised, as hardly proceeding from the same Divine source." The Eps. of St. P. to the Corinthians, 1876, p. 210 f. Imagine this state of things in a community endowed with so many supernatural gifts!

but, however rare may be the virtue, it will scarcely now be recognized as miraculous, although it is here shown to be more desirable and precious than all the miraculous gifts. Even Apostolic conceptions of the Supernatural cannot soar above the range of natural morality.

The real nature of the "gift of Tongues" has given rise to an almost interminable controversy, and innumerable treatises have been written upon the subject. It would have been impossible for us to have exhaustively entered upon such a discussion in this work, for which it only possesses an incidental and passing interest; but fortunately such a course is rendered unnecessary by the fact that, so far as we are concerned, the miraculous nature of the "gift" alone comes into question, and may be disposed of without any elaborate analysis of past controversy or minute reference to disputed points. Those who desire to follow the course of the voluminous discussion will find ample materials in the treatises which we shall at least indicate in the course of our remarks, and we shall adhere as closely as possible to our own point of view.

In 1 Cor. xii. 10, the Apostle mentions amongst the other Charismata "kinds of tongues" (*γένη γλωσσῶν*) and "interpretation of tongues" (*ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν*), as two distinct gifts. In v. 28 he again uses the expression *γένη γλωσσῶν*, and in a following verse he inquires: "do all speak with tongues" (*γλώσσαις λαλοῦσι*)?[1] "do all interpret" (*διερμηνεύουσι*)? He says shortly after, xiii. 1: "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels (*ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγελων*) and have not love," &c. In the following chapter the expressions used in discussing the gift vary.

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 5, 6, 18, 23, 39; Acts x. 46, xix. 6.

In xiv. 2 he says: "he that speaketh with a tongue"[1] (λαλῶν γλώσσῃ),[2] using the singular; and again (v. 22), of "the tongues" (αἱ γλῶσσαι), being a sign; and in v. 26, each "hath a tongue" (γλῶσσαν ἔχει). The word γλῶσσα or γλῶττα has several significations in Greek. The first and primary meaning "the tongue": as a mere member of the body, the organ of speech; next, a tongue, or language; and further, an obsolete or foreign word not in ordinary use. If we inquire into the use of γλῶσσα in the New Testament, we find that, setting aside the passages in Acts, Mark, and 1 Cor. xii.-xiv., in which the phenomenon we are discussing is referred to, the word is invariably used in the first sense, "the tongue,"[3] except in the Apocalypse, where the word as "language" typifies different nations.[4] Any one who attentively considers all the passages in which the Charisma is discussed will observe that no uniform application of any one signification throughout is possible. We may briefly say that all the attempts which have been made philologically to determine the true nature of the phenomenon which the Apostle discusses have failed to produce any really satisfactory result, or to secure the general adhesion of critics. It is we think obvious that Paul does not apply the word, either in the plural or in the singular, in its ordinary senses, but makes use of γλῶσσα to describe phenomena connected with speech, without intending strictly to apply it either to the tongue or to a definite language. We

[1] The rendering of the Authorized Version "an *unknown* tongue," is wholly imaginary. The "with" which we adopt is more frequently rendered "in;" it is a mere matter of opinion of course, but we maintain "with." [2] Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 4, 13, 14, 19, 27.

[3] Mark vii. 33, 35; Luke i. 64, xvi. 24; Acts ii. 3, 26; Rom. iii. 13, xiv. 11; Philip. ii. 11; James i. 26, iii. 5, 6 twice, 8; 1 Pet. iii. 10; 1 John iii. 18; cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 1; Apoc. xvi. 10.

[4] Apoc. v. 9, vii. 9, x. 11, xi. 9, xiii. 7, xiv. 6, xvii. 15.

merely refer to this in passing, for it is certain that no philological discussion of the word can materially affect the case; and the argument is of no interest for our inquiry. Each meaning has been adopted by critics and been made the basis for a different explanation of the phenomenon. Philology is incapable of finally solving such a problem.

From the time of Irenæus,[1] or at least Origen, the favourite theory of the Fathers, based chiefly upon the narrative in Acts of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, was that the disciples suddenly became supernaturally endowed with power to speak other languages which they had not previously learned, and that this gift was more especially conferred to facilitate the promulgation of the Gospel thoughout the world. Augustine went so far as to believe that each of the Apostles was thus enabled to speak all languages.[2] The opinion that the "gift of tongues" consisted in the power, miraculously conferred by the Holy Ghost, to speak in a language or languages previously unknown to the speaker long continued to prevail, and it is still the popular, as well as the orthodox, view of the subject. As soon as

[1] Propter quod et Apostolus ait: 'Sapientiam loquimur inter perfectos;' perfectos dicens eos qui perceperunt Spiritum Dei, et omnibus linguis loquuntur per Spiritum Dei, quemadmodum et ipse loquebatur. Καθὼς καὶ πολλῶν ἀκούομεν ἀδελφῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, προφητικὰ χαρίσματα ἐχόντων, καὶ παντοδαπαῖς λαλούντων διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος γλώσσαις, καὶ τὰ κρύφια τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς φανερὸν ἀγόντων, κ. τ. λ. *Irenæus*, Adv. hær. v. 6 § 1, *Eusebius*, H. E. v. 7.

[2] De Verb. Apost. clxxv. 3; Serm. 9: "Loquebatur enim tunc unus homo omnibus linguis, quia locutura erat unitas ecclesiæ in omnibus linguis."

[3] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 15 f.; *von Döllinger*, Christ. u. Kirche, p. 336 f.; *Ebrard*, zu Olsh. Apg., p. 56; *Englmann*, Von den Charismen, 1849, p. 261 ff.; *Kling*, Stud. u. Kr., 1839, p. 487 ff.; *Maier*, Die Glossolalie d. apost. Zeitalter, 1855; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 56 f.; Bibl. Comm. iii. p. 711 f.; *Osiander*, Comm. erst. Br. P. an die Korinthier,

the attention of critics was seriously directed to the question, however, this interpretation became rapidly modified, or was altogether abandoned. It is unnecessary for us to refer in detail to the numerous explanations which have been given of the phenomenon, or to enumerate the extraordinary views which have been expressed regarding it; it will be sufficient if, without reference to minor differences of opinion respecting the exact form in which it exhibited itself, we broadly state that a great majority of critics, rejecting the theory that γλώσσαις λαλεῖν means to speak languages previously unknown to the speakers, pronounce it to be the speech of persons in a state of ecstatic excitement, chiefly of the nature of prayer or praise, and unintelligible to ordinary hearers.[1] Whether

1847, p. 546 ff.; *Rossteuscher*, Die Gabe d. Sprachen im apost. Zeit., 1850, p. 80 ff.; *Rückert*, Der erste Br. an die Kor., 1836, p. 448 ff.; *Schaff*, K. G. 2te aufl., p. 203 ff.; *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im ap. Z., p. 67 f.; *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., St. Paul's Eps., p. 128, 131 *f.*

[1] *Baur*, Tüb. Zeitschr. 1830, ii. p. 75 ff.; Stud. u. Krit., 1838, p. 618 ff.; Theol. Jahrb., 1850, p. 182 ff.; *Bleek*, Stud. u. Krit., 1829, p. 17 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 223; *Delitzsch*, Syst. bibl. Psychologie, 2te aufl., p. 362 f.; *Eichhorn*, Allg. Biblioth. bibl. Lit., i. p. 91 ff., 775 ff.; ii. p 795. ff.; iii. p. 225 ff.; *Hausrath*, Der Ap. Paulus, p. 53, 387 f.; in Schenkel's B. L., iv. p. 431 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Glosslalie d. alt. Kirche, 1850, p. 23 ff.; Einl., p. 275 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 440; *Keim*, in Herzog's R. E., xviii. p. 688 ff.; *Meyer*, 1 Br. an die Korinth., 5te Aufl., p. 345 f.; Apg., p. 57 ff.; Ev. Mark. u. Luk., p. 217 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 11 ff.; Ausl. beid. Br. an die Cor., 1869, p. 204; *Noack*, Ursprung d. Christenth., ii. p. 282 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 26 ff.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 234 f.; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 355 f.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 61 ff.; *Reuss*, Rev. d. Théol., 1851, iii. p. 65 ff.; *Riehm*, Stud. u. Krit., 1865, p. 21 f.; *Schulz*, Die Geistesgaben d. erst. Christ., 1836, p. 57 ff., 140 f.; Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 752 ff.; *Stanley*, St. Paul's Eps. to the Cor., 4th ed., p. 245 ff.; *Steudel*, Tüb. Zeitschr., 1830, ii. p. 133 ff.; 1831, ii. p. 128 ff.; *Wieseler*, Stud. u. Krit., 1838, p. 703 ff.; 1860, p. 111 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 85 ff. Cf. *von Döllinger*, Christ. u. K., p. 337 ff.; *Ewald*, Sendschr. des Ap. P., p. 201 ff; Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 110 ff.; *v. Hengel*, De Gave der talen, p. 90 ff.; *Kling*, Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 493 f.; *Olshausen*, Stud. u. Krit. 1831, p. 568 ff.; Bibl. Comment. iii. p. 709 ff.; Apg., p. 47 ff.; *Schaff*, K. G., p. 203 ff.

this speech consisted of mere inarticulate tones, of excited ejaculations, of obsolete or uncommon expressions and provincialisms, of highly poetical rhapsodies, of prayer in slow scarcely audible accents, or of chaunted mysterious phrases, fragmentary and full of rapturous intensity, as these critics variously suppose, we shall not pause to inquire. It is clear that, whatever may have been the form of the speech, if instead of being speech in unlearnt languages supernaturally communicated, γλώσσαις λαλεῖν was only the expression of religious excitement, however that may be supposed to have originated, the pretentions of the gift to a miraculous character shrink at once into exceedingly small proportions.

Every unprejudiced mind must admit that the representation that the gift of "tongues," of which the Apostle speaks in his Epistle to the Corinthians, conferred upon the recipient the power to speak foreign languages before unknown to him, may in great part be traced to the narrative in Acts of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Although a few apologists advance the plea that there may have been differences in the manifestation, it is generally recognized on both sides that, however differently described by the two writers, the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν of Paul and of the Acts is one and the same phenomenon. The impression conveyed by the narrative has been applied to the didactic remarks of Paul, and a meaning forced upon them which they cannot possibly bear. It is not too much to say that, but for the mythical account in the Acts, no one would ever have supposed that the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν of Paul was the gift of speaking foreign languages without previous study or practice. In the interminable controversy regarding the phenomenon, moreover, it seems to us to have been a

fundamental error, on both sides too often, to have considered it necessary to the acceptance of any explanation that it should equally suit both the remarks of Paul and the account in Acts.[1] The only right course is to test the narrative by the distinct and authoritative statements of the Apostle; but to adopt the contrary course is much the same procedure as altering the natural interpretation of an original historical document in order to make it agree with the romance of some unknown writer of a later day. The Apostle Paul writes as a contemporary and eye-witness of phenomena which affected himself, and regarding which he gives the most valuable direct and indirect information. The unknown Author of the Acts was not an eye-witness of the scene which he describes, and his narrative bears upon its very surface the clearest marks of traditional and legendary treatment. The ablest apologists freely declare that the evidence of Paul is of infinitely greater value than that of the unknown and later writer, and must be preferred before it. The majority of those who profess to regard the narrative as historical explain away its clearest statements with startling ingenuity, or conceal them beneath a cloud of words. The references to the phenomenon in later portions of the Acts are in themselves quite inconsistent with the earlier narrative in ch. ii. The detailed criticism of Paul is the only contemporary, and it is certainly the only trustworthy, account we possess regarding the gift of "tongues."[2] We must, therefore, dismiss from our minds, if possible, the bias which the narrative in the Acts has unfortunately

[1] Cf. *Baur*, Stud. u. Krit. 1838, p. 620 f.

[2] We need not here say anything of the reference in Mark xvi. 17, which is undoubtedly a later and spurious addition to the Gospel.

created, and attend solely to the words of the Apostle. If his report of the phenomenon, discredit that of the unknown and later writer, so much the worse for the latter. In any case it is the testimony of Paul which is referred to and which we are called upon to consider, and later writers must not be allowed to invest it with impossible meanings. Even if we had not such undeniable reasons for preferring the statements of Paul to the later and untrustworthy narrative of an unknown writer, the very contents of the latter, contrasted with the more sober remarks of the Apostle, would consign it to a very subordinate place. Discussing the miracle of Pentecost in Acts, which he, of course, regards as the instantaneous communication of ability to speak in foreign languages, Zeller makes the following remarks: "The supposition of such a miracle is opposed to a right view of divine agency, and of the relation of God to the world, and, in this case in particular, to a right view of the constitution of the human mind. The composition and the properties of a body may be altered though external influence, but mental acquirements are attained only through personal activity, through practice; and it is just in this that spirit distinguishes itself from matter: that it is free, that there is nothing in it which it has not itself spontaneously introduced. The external and instantaneous in-pouring of a mental acquirement is a representation which refutes itself." In reply to those who object to this reasoning he retorts: "The assertion that such a miracle actually occurred contradicts the analogy of all attested experience, that it is invented by an individual or by tradition corresponds with it; when, therefore, the historical writer has only the choice between these two

alternatives, he must according to the laws of historical probability, under all the circumstances, unconditionally decide for the second. He must do this even if an eye-witness of the pretended miracle stood before him; he must all the more do so if he has to do with a statement which, beyond doubt not proceeding from an eye-witness, is more possibly separated by some generations from the event in question." [1]

These objections are not confined to rationalistic critics and do not merely represent the arguments of scepticism. Neander expresses similar sentiments,[2] and after careful examination pronounces the narrative in Acts untrustworthy, and, adhering to the representations of Paul, rejects the theory that γλώσσαις λαλεῖν was speech in foreign languages supernaturally imparted. Meyer, who arrives at much the same result as Neander, speaks still more emphatically. He says: "*This* supposed gift of tongues (all languages), however, was in the apostolic age, partly *unnecessary* for the preaching of the Gospel, as the preachers thereof only required to be able to speak Hebrew and Greek; partly *too general*, as amongst the assembly there were certainly many who were not called to be teachers. And, on the other hand, again, it would also have been *premature*, as, before all, Paul the apostle of the Gentiles would have required it, in whom nevertheless there is as little trace of any *subsequent* reception of it as that he preached otherwise than in Hebrew and Greek. *But now, how is the event to be historically judged?* Regarding this the following is to be observed: As the instantaneous bestowal of facility in a foreign language is neither logically possible nor psychologically

[1] *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesh., p. 85 f.
[2] Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 16.

and morally conceivable, and as not the slightest intimation of such a thing in the Apostles is perceptible in their Epistles and elsewhere (on the contrary, comp. xiv. 11); as, further, if it was only momentary, the impossibility increases, and as Peter himself in his speech does not once make the slightest reference to the foreign languages: therefore,—whether, without any intimation in the text, one consider that Pentecost assembly as a representation of all future christianity, or not—the occurrence, as Luke relates it, cannot be transmitted in its actual historical circumstance." [1]

Let us a little examine the particulars of the narrative in Acts ii. All the brethren were assembled in one place, a house (οἶκος), on the morning of the day of Pentecost. In the preceding chapter (i. 15) we learn that the number of disciples was then about 120, and the crowd which came together when the miraculous occurrence took place must have been great, seeing that it is stated that 3,000 souls were baptized and added to the Church upon the occasion (ii. 41). Passing over the statement as to the numbers of the disciples, which might well surprise us after the information given by the Gospels,[2] we may ask in what house in Jerusalem could such a multitude have assembled? Apologists have exhausted their ingenuity in replying to the question, but whether placing the scene in one of the halls or courts of the Temple, or in an imaginary house in one of the streets leading to the Temple, the explanation is equally vague and unsatisfactory. How did the multitude so rapidly know of what was passing in a private house? We shall say nothing at present of the sound of the

[1] *Meyer*, Kr. ex. H'buch üb. die Apostelgesch., 4te aufl., 1870, p. 54 f.
[2] John xvi. 31; Mt. xxviii. 7.

"rushing mighty wind" which filled all the house, nor of the descent of the "tongues as of fire," nor of the various interpretations of these phenomena by apologetic writers. These incidents scarcely add to the historical character of the narrative, nor can it be pronounced either clear or consistent. The brethren assembled were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues (λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις), as the Spirit gave them utterance."[1] Apologists, in order somewhat to save the historical credit of the account and reconcile it with the statements of Paul, have variously argued that there is no affirmation made in the narrative that speech in foreign languages previously unknown was imparted. The members of the fifteen nations who hear the Galilæans speaking "in our own language wherein we were born" (τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ ἡμῶν ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθημεν) are disposed of with painful ingenuity; but, passing over all this, it is recognized by unprejudiced critics on both sides that at least the Author of Acts, in writing this account, intended to represent the brethren as instantaneously speaking those previously unknown foreign languages. A few writers, represent the miracle to have been one of hearing rather than of speaking, the brethren merely praising God in their own tongue, the Aramaic, but the spectators understanding in their various languages.[2] This merely shifts the difficulty from the speakers to the hearers, and the explanation is generally repudiated. It is, however, freely granted by all that history does not exhibit a single instance of such a gift of tongues having ever been made useful for the purpose of

[1] Acts ii. 4.

[2] *Schneckenburger*, Beiträge, p. 84; *Svenæen*, Zeitschr. luth. Th. u. Kirche, 1859, p. 1 ff. This view was anciently held by Gregory Naz. (Orat. 44), and some of the Fathers, and in more recent times it was adopted by Erasmus and others.

preaching the gospel.[1] Paul, who claimed the possession of the gift of tongues in a superlative degree (1 Cor. xiv. 18), does not appear to have spoken more languages than Aramaic and Greek. He writes to the Romans in the latter tongue and not in Latin, and to the Galatians in the same language instead of their own. Peter, who appears to have addressed the assembled nations in Greek on this very occasion, does not in his speech either refer to foreign languages or claim the gift himself, for in v. 15 he speaks only of others. "For *these* (οὗτοι) are not drunken." Every one remembers the ancient tradition recorded by Papias, and generally believed by the Fathers, that Mark accompanied Peter as his "interpreter" (ἑρμηνευτής).[2] The first Epistle bearing the name of Peter, and addressed to some of the very nations mentioned in Acts, to sojourners "in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," is written in Greek; and so is the "Epistle to the Hebrews" and the other works of the New Testament. Few will be inclined to deny that, to take only one language for instance, the Greek of the writings of the New Testament leaves something to be desired, and that, if the writers possessed such a supernatural gift, they evidently did not speak even so important and current a language with absolute purity. "Le style des écrivains sacrés," writes a modern apolo-

[1] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 15; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 120, anm. 2; *Kling*, Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 494 f.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 54 f.; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 354, note; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 12 ff.; Br. an die Cor., p. 294 f.; *Olshausen*, Apg., p. 52 f.; *de Pressensé*, Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 356; *Reuss*, Rev. d. Théol., 1851, iii. p. 83 ff.; *Schaff*, K. G., p. 204 f.; *Stanley*, Eps. to the Cor., p. 249 f.; *Thiersch*, Die K. im ap. Z., p. 69; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 87 f.

[2] Cf. *Eusebius*, H. E., iii. 39, v. 8; *Irenæus*, Adv. hær., iii. 1§1; *Tertullian*, Adv. Marc., iv. 5. Of course there is doubt as to the sense in which ἑρμηνευτής is to be understood, although that of interpreter of language is certainly the most natural.

gist, "montre clairement qu'ils ont appris la langue grecque et qu'ils ne la possèdent pas de droit divin et par inspiration, car ils l'écrivent sans correction, en la surchargeant de locutions hébraïques."[1] In fact, as most critics point out, there never was a period at which a gift of foreign tongues was less necessary for intercourse with the civilized world, Greek or Hellenistic Greek being almost everywhere current. As regards the fifteen nations who are supposed to have been represented on this great occasion, Neander says: "It is certain that amongst the inhabitants of towns in Cappadocia, in Pontus, in Asia Minor, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Cyrene, and in the parts of Libya and Egypt peopled by Greek and Jewish colonies, the Greek language was in great part more current than the old national tongue. There remain, out of the whole catalogue of languages, at most the Persian, Syriac, Arabic, Greek, and Latin. The more rhetorical than historical stamp of the narrative is evident."[2] This rhetorical character as contradistinguished from sober history is indeed painfully apparent throughout. The presence in Jerusalem of Jews, devout men "from every nation under heaven" is dramatically opportune, and thus representatives of the fifteen nations are prepared to appear in the house and hear their own languages in which they were born spoken in so supernatural, though useless, a manner by the brethren. They are all said to have been "confounded" at the phenomenon, and the writer adds, v. 7f: "And they were all amazed and marvelled, saying, Behold, are not all these which speak Galilæans? And how hear we every man in our own

[1] *De Pressensé*, Hist. des Trois prem. Siècles, i. p. 356. *Neander* (Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 14 f.), *Reuss* (Rev. d. Théol., 1851, iii. p. 84 f.), and many other able writers, still more strongly enforce these arguments.

[2] *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 18.

language wherein we were born?" &c. Did all the multitude say this? Or is not this the writer ascribing, according to his view, probable sentiments to them? How again did they know that the hundred and twenty or more brethren were Galilæan? Further on, the writer adds more of the same kind, v. 12, 13: "And they were all amazed and were in doubt, saying one to another: What may this mean? But others mocking said, They are full of sweet wine." Is it not a strange manner of accounting for such a phenomenon as (v. 11) hearing people speaking in their own tongues the great works of God to suppose that they are drunken? People speaking with tongues, in Paul's sense (1 Cor. xiv. 23, 24, 33), and creating an unintelligible tumult, might well lead strangers to say that they were either mad or drunken, but the praise of God in foreign language, understood by so many, could not convey such an impression. Peter does not, in explanation, simply state that they are speaking foreign languages which have just been supernaturally imparted to them, but argues (v. 15) that "these are not drunken, as ye suppose, for it is the third hour of the day,"—too early to be "full of sweet wine," and proceeds to assert that the phenomenon is, on the contrary, a fulfilment of a prophecy of Joel in which, although the pouring out of God's Spirit upon all flesh is promised "in the last days," and as a result that: "your sons and your daughters shall prophesy and your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams," not a single word is said of any gift of "tongues," foreign or otherwise. The miraculous phenomenon in question is not mentioned in the prophecy of which it is supposed to be the accomplishment. It does not much help matters to argue that the miracle, although not for future use, was intended as a

sign. We shall see what Paul says regarding γλώσσαις λαλεῖν as a sign, but we may here merely point out that the effect produced in the Corinthian Church is rather an impression of madness, whilst here it leads to a mocking accusation of drunkenness. The conversion of the 3,000 is by no means referred to the speaking with tongues, but simply to the speech of Peter (ii. 37f. 41). From every point of view, there is no cohesion between the different parts of the narrative ; it is devoid of verisimilitude. It is not surprising that so many critics of all shades of opinion recognize unhistorical elements in the narrative in Acts,[1] not to use a stronger term. To allow such an account to influence our interpretation of Paul's statements regarding the gift of tongues is quite out of the question; and no one who appreciates the nature of the case and who carefully examines the narrative of the unknown writer can, we think, hesitate to reject his theory of a supernatural bestowal of power to speak foreign languages, before unknown.

It is not difficult to trace the origin of the account in Acts and, although we cannot here pause to do so with any minuteness, we may at least indicate the lines upon which the narrative is based. There is no doubt that then, as now, the Jews commemorated at the feast of Pentecost the giving of the law on Sinai.[2] It seemed

[1] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 96; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. 222 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 387 ff.; *Holtzmann*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., viii. p. 336, 437 ff., iv. 287 f.; *Keim*, in Herzog's R. E., xviii. p. 689 ff.; Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 596, anm. 2; *Noack*, Urspr. d. Christ., 1857, ii. p. 280 f.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. xxvii. f.; *Reuss*, Rev. de Théol., 1851, iii. p. 90 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 512; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 82 ff. Cf. *Bleek*, Stud. u. Krit., 1830, p. 53; *Hausrath*, Der Ap. Paulus, p. 99 ff.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 54 ff.; 1 Br. an die Cor., p. 341; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 17 ff.; *Schulz*, Geistesg. d. erst. Christen., p. 58 f., 86 f.; Stud. u. Krit., 1839, p. 76.

[2] *Schneckenburger*, Beiträge zur Einl. N. T., 1832, p. 79; *Lightfoot*,

good to the Author of Acts that the prophet like unto Moses,[1] who was to abrogate that law and replace it by a dispensation of grace, should inaugurate the new law of love and liberty[2] with signs equally significant and miraculous. It is related in Exodus xix. 18 that the Lord descended upon Sinai "in fire," and that the whole mount quaked greatly. The voice of God pronounced the decalogue and, as the Septuagint version renders our Ex. xx. 18: "All the people saw the voice, and the lightnings and the voice of the trumpet and the mountain smoking."[3] According to Rabbinical tradition, however, when God came down to give the law to the Israelites, he appeared not to Israel alone, but to all the other nations, and the voice in which the law was given went to the ends of the earth and was heard of all peoples.[4] It will be remembered that the number of the nations was supposed to be seventy, each speaking a different language, and the law was given in the one sacred Hebrew tongue. The Rabbins explained, however: "The voice from Sinai was divided into 70 voices and 70 languages, so that all nations of the earth heard (the law), and each heard it actually in its own language."[5] And again: "Although the ten commandments were promulgated with one single tone, yet it is said (Exod. xx. 15), 'All people heard the voices' (in the plural and not the voice in the singular); "the reason is: As the voice went forth it was divided into seven voices,

Works, ed. Pitman, 1823, viii. p. 42 f.; *Schoettgen*, Horæ Hebr., p. 408; *Gfrörer*, Das Jahrh. des Heils, 1838, ii. 390 f.

[1] Acts iii. 22, vii. 37.

[2] Cf. Gal. iv. 21 ff.

[3] Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἑώρα τὴν φωνὴν, καὶ τὰς λαμπάδας, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν τῆς σάλπιγγος, καὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ καπνίζον· κ. τ. λ.

[4] Bab. Sevachim, 116 a.; *Gfrörer*, Das Jahrh. des Heils, ii. 392 f.

[5] Schemoth Rabba, 70 d.; *Gfrörer*, Ib. ii. 393.

and then into seventy tongues, and every people heard the Law in its own mother-tongue."[1] The same explanation is given of Ps. lxviii. 11, and the separation of the voice into seven voices and seventy tongues is likened to the sparks beaten by a hammer from molten metal on the anvil.[2] Philo expresses the same ideas in several places. We can only extract one passage in which, speaking of the giving of the law on Sinai, and discussing the manner in which God proclaimed the decalogue, he says: "For God is not like a man in need of a voice and of a tongue . . . but it seems to me that at that time he performed a most holy and beseeming wonder, commanding an invisible voice to be created in air, more wonderful than all instruments, ... not lifeless, but neither a form of living creature composed of body and soul, but a reasonable soul full of clearness and distinctness, which formed and excited the air and transformed it into flaming fire, and sounded forth such an articulated voice, like breath through a trumpet, that it seemed to be equally heard by those who were near and those furthest off."[3] A little further on he says: "But from the midst of the fire streaming from heaven, a most awful voice sounded forth, the flame being articulated to language familiar to the hearers, which made that which was said so vividly clear, as to seem rather seeing than

[1] Midrash Tanchumah, 26, c.; *Gfrörer*, Ib., ii. 393.

[2] Midrash Tillin; Bab. Schabbath, 85 b.; *Gfrörer*, Ib., ii. 393 f.

[3] *Οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεός, στόματος καὶ γλώττης καὶ ἀρτηριῶν δεόμενος, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον ἱεροπρεπέστατόν τι θαυματουργῆσαι, κελεύσας ἠχὴν ἀόρατον ἐν ἀέρι δημιουργηθῆναι, πάντων ὀργάνων θαυμασιώτερον . . . . οὐκ ἄψυχον ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς τρόπον ζώου συνεστηκυίαν, ἀλλὰ ψυχὴν λογικὴν ἀνάπλεων σαφηνείας καὶ τρανότητος, ἣ τὸν ἀέρα σχηματίσασα καὶ ἐπιτείνασα καὶ πρὸς πῦρ φλογοειδὲς μεταβαλοῦσα, καθάπερ πνεῦμα διὰ σάλπιγγος φωνὴν τοσαύτην ἔναρθρον ἐξήχησεν, ὡς τοῖς ἔγγιστα τοὺς πορρώτατω κατ' ἴσον ἀκροᾶσθαι δοκεῖν.* De decem Oraculis, § 9, ed. Mangey, ii. 185 f.

hearing it."[1] It requires no elaborate explanation to show how this grew into the miracle at Pentecost at the inauguration of the Christian dispensation, when suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind which filled all the house where the disciples were, and there appeared to them tongues as of fire parting asunder which sat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues, even as the Spirit gave them utterance, so that devout men from every nation under heaven heard them speaking, everyone in his own language wherein he was born, the great works of God.[2]

When we turn to the other passages in the Acts where the gift of tongues is mentioned, we find that the interpretation of foreign languages supernaturally imparted is quite out of place. When Peter is sent to Cornelius, as he is addressing the centurion and his household, and even before they are baptized (x. 44), "the Holy Spirit fell on all them who hear the word;" and the sign of it is (v. 46) that they are heard "speaking with tongues and magnifying God" (*λαλούντων γλώσσαις καὶ μεγαλυνόντων τὸν θεόν*), precisely like the disciples at Pentecost (cf ii. 11, xi. 15f.). Now as this gift fell on all who heard the word (x. 44), it could not be a sign to unbelievers; and the idea that Cornelius and his house immediately began to speak in foreign languages, which, as in the case

[1] *Φωνὴ δὲ ἐκ μέσου τοῦ ῥυέντος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ πυρὸς ἐξήχει καταπληκτικωτάτη, τῆς φλογὸς εἰς διάλεκτον ἀρθρουμένης τὴν συνήθη τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις, ἢ τὰ λεγόμενα οὕτως ἐναργῶς ἐτρανοῦτο, ὡς ὁρᾶν ἀντὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀκούειν δοκεῖν.* De decem Oraculis, § 11 ed. *Mangey*, ii. 188; cf. De Septenario et festis, § 22 ed. *Mangey*, ii. 295 f.

[2] *Schneckenburger*, Beiträge zur Einl. N. T., p. 80 ff.; Zweck der Apostelgesch., p. 203 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Das Jahrh. des Heils, ii. 392 ff.; Die heil. Sage, i. p. 387 ff.; *Zeller*, Die Apostelgesch., p. 110 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette's Apg., p. 34 f.; *Hausrath*, Der Apostel Paulus, p. 100 f.

of the Corinthians, probably no one understood, instead of simply "magnifying God" in their own tongue, which everyone understood, is almost ludicrous, if without offence we may venture to say so. The same remarks apply to xix. 6. We must again allow an eminent apologist, who will not be accused of irreverence, to characterise such a representation. "Now in such positions and such company, speech in foreign tongues would be something altogether without object and without meaning. Where the consciousness of the grace of salvation, and of a heavenly life springing from it, is first aroused in man, his own mother tongue verily, not a foreign language, will be the natural expression of his feelings. Or we must imagine a magical power which, taking possession of men, like instruments without volition, forces them to utter strange tones—a thing contradicting all analogy in the operations of Christianity." [1] The good sense of the critic revolts against the natural submission of the apologist.

We have diverged so far in order prominently to bring before the reader the nature and source of the hypothesis that the gift of "tongues" signifies instantaneous power to speak unlearnt foreign languages. Such an interpretation is derived almost entirely from the mythical narrative in the Acts of the Apostles. We shall now proceed to consider the statements of the Apostle Paul, and endeavour to ascertain what the supposed miraculous Charisma really is. That it is something very different from what the unknown writer represents it in the episode of Pentecost cannot be doubted. "Whoever has, even once, read with attention what Paul writes of the speaking with tongues in the Corinthian community," writes Thiersch, "knows that the difference between that gift of tongues

[1] *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 19.

and this (of Acts ii.) could scarcely be greater. There, a speech which no mortal can understand without interpretation, and also no philologist, but the Holy Spirit alone can interpret; here, a speech which requires no interpretation. That gift serves only for the edification of the speaker, this clearly also for that of the hearer. The one is of no avail for the instruction of the ignorant; the other, clearly, is imparted wholly for that purpose."[1]

It may be well that we should state a few reasons which show that Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians does not intend, in speaking of γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, to represent speech in foreign languages. In the very outset of his dissertation on the subject (xiv. 2), Paul very distinctly declares as the principal reason for preferring prophecy to the gift of tongues: "For he that speaketh with a tongue (λαλῶν γλώσσῃ) speaketh not unto men but unto God: for no one understandeth[2] (οὐδεὶς ἀκούει)." How could this be said if γλώσσῃ λαλεῖν meant merely speaking a foreign language? The presence of a single person versed in the language spoken would in such a case vitiate the whole of Paul's argument. The statement made is general, it will be observed, and not limited to one community, but applied to a place like Corinth, one of the greatest commercial cities, in which merchants, seamen, and visitors of all countries were to be found, it would have been unreasonable to have characterized a foreign tongue as absolutely unintelligible. In xiv. 9, Paul says: "So likewise ye, unless ye utter by the tongue (διὰ τῆς γλώσσης) words

[1] *Thiersch*, Die Kirche im apost. Zeitalter, 2te aufl., 1858, p. 68 f.

[2] The literal meaning of course is, "no one heareth," but the sense is "heareth *with the understanding*." Cf. Mk. iv. 33 and the lxx. version of Gen. xi. 7, Isaiah xxxvi. 11, &c., &c., where ἀκούειν has this meaning. The word is rightly rendered in the A. V.

easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye will be speaking into air." How could Paul use the expression "by the tongue" if he meant a foreign language in v. 2 and elsewhere? He is comparing γλώσσαις λαλεῖν in the preceding verses with the sounds of musical instruments, and the point reached in v. 9 clearly brings home the application of his argument: the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν is unintelligible, like the pipe or harp, and unless the tongue utter words which have an understood meaning, it is mere speaking into air. Is it possible that Paul would call speech in a language, foreign to him, perhaps, but which nevertheless was the mother tongue of some nation, "speaking into air"? In such a case he must have qualified his statement by obvious explanations, of which not a word appears throughout his remarks. That he does not speak of foreign languages is made still more clear by the next two verses, v. 10: in which, continuing his argument from analogy, he actually compares γλώσσαις λαλεῖν with speech in foreign languages, and ends, v. 11: "If, therefore, I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian (foreigner) and he that speaketh a barbarian (foreigner) in my judgment."[1] Paul's logic is certainly not always beyond reproach, but he cannot be accused of perpetrating such an antithesis as contrasting a thing with itself. He, therefore, explicitly distinguishes (v. 10) γένη φωνῶν "kinds of languages"[2] from (xii. 10, 28, &c.) γένη γλωσσῶν "kinds of tongues." In xiv. 6, Paul says: "If I come unto you speaking with tongues (γλώσσαις λαλῶν) what shall I profit you, unless I shall

[1] ἐὰν οὖν μὴ εἰδῶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς, ἔσομαι τῷ λαλοῦντι βάρβαρος καὶ ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἐμοὶ βάρβαρος. 1 Cor. xiv. 11.

[2] It is unnecessary to show that φωνή is used to express language.

speak to you either in revelation, or in knowledge, or in prophecy, or in teaching?" (*ἐν ἀποκαλύψει ἢ ἐν γνώσει ἢ ἐν προφητείᾳ ἢ ἐν διδαχῇ*); and then he goes on to compare such unintelligible speech with musical instruments. Now it is obvious that revelation, knowledge, prophecy and teaching might equally be expressed in foreign languages, and, therefore, in "speaking with tongues" it is no mere difficulty of expression which makes it unprofitable, but that general unintelligibility which is the ground of the whole of Paul's objections. Paul claims: v. 18 "I thank God I speak with a tongue (*γλώσσῃ λαλῶ*)[1] more than ye all, 19. but in a church I would rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may teach others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue (*ἐν γλώσσῃ*)."[2] We have already pointed out that there is no evidence whatever that Paul could speak many languages. So far as we have any information, he only made use of Greek and Aramaic, and never even preached where those languages were not current. He always employed the former in his Epistles, whether addressed to Corinth, Galatia, or Rome, and his knowledge even of that language was certainly not perfect. Speaking "with a tongue" cannot, for reasons previously given, mean a foreign language; and this is still more obvious from what he says in v. 19, just quoted, in which he distinguishes speaking with a tongue from speaking with his understanding. Five words so spoken are better than ten thousand in a tongue, because he speaks

[1] This is the reading of A, D, E, F, G, ℵ, and other ancient codices, and is adopted by most critics in preference to *γλώσσαις* the reading of B, K, L.

[2] 18. *εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ, πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσῃ λαλῶ,* 19. *ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ θέλω πέντε λόγους τῷ νοΐ μου λαλῆσαι, ἵνα καὶ ἄλλους κατηχήσω, ἢ μυρίους λόγους ἐν γλώσσῃ.* 1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19.

with the understanding in the one case and without it in the second. It is clear that a man speaks with his understanding as much in one language as another, but it is the main characteristic of the speech we are discussing that it is throughout opposed to understanding : cf. vv. 14, 15. It would be inconceivable that, if this gift really signified power to speak foreign languages, Paul could on the one hand use the expressions in this letter with regard to it, and on the other that he could have failed to add remarks consistent with such an interpretation. For instance is it possible that the Apostle in repressing the exercise of the Charisma, as he does, could have neglected to point out some other use for it than mere personal edification? Could he have omitted to tell some of these speakers with tongues that, instead of wasting their languages in a church where no one understood them, it would be well for them to employ them in the instruction of the nations whose tongues had been supernaturally imparted to them? As it is, Paul checks the use of a gift bestowed by the Holy Spirit, and reduces its operation to the smallest limits, without once indicating so obvious a sphere of usefulness for the miraculous power. We need not, however, proceed to further arguments upon this branch of the subject; although, in treating other points, additional evidence will constantly present itself. For the reasons we have stated, and many others, the great majority of critics are agreed that the gift of tongues, according to Paul, was not the power of speaking foreign languages previously unknown.[1] But for the narrative in Acts ii. no one would ever have thought of such an interpretation.

[1] So Bardili, Baur, Bleek, Davidson, Eichhorn, Ewald, Fritzsche, Gfrörer, Hausrath, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Keim, Meyer, Neander,

Coming now to consider the two Charismata, "kinds of tongues" and "the interpretation of tongues," more immediately in connection with our inquiry, as so-called miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, we shall first endeavour to ascertain some of their principal characteristics. The theory of foreign languages supernaturally imparted without previous study may be definitively laid aside. The interpretation of tongues may go with it, but requires a few observations. It is clear from Paul's words throughout this dissertation that the interpretation of tongues not only was not invariably attached to the gift of tongues[1] (1 Cor. xiv. 13, 27, 28), but was at least often a separate gift possessed without the kinds of tongues (cf. xii. 10, 28, xiv. 26, 28). Nothing can be more specific than xii. 10 ". . to another kinds of tongues; and to another interpretation of tongues;" and again, v. 30: "do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" This is indeed presaged by the "diversities of gifts," &c., of xii. 4ff. Upon the hypothesis of foreign languages, this would presuppose that some spoke languages which they could not interpret, and consequently could not understand, and that others understood languages which they could not speak. The latter point is common enough in ordinary life; but, in this instance, the miracle of supernaturally receiving a perfect knowledge of lan-

Noack, Olshausen, Overbeck, Paulus, Pfleiderer, de Pressensé, Renan, Reuss, Schaff, Schrader, Schulz, Schwegler, Stap, Steudel, de Wette, Wieseler, Weisse, Zeller, and others.

[1] *Ewald* maintains that "interpretation" was always separate from "tongues." Die Sendschr. des Ap. Paul., p. 205, anm. *Wieseler* at one time (St. u. Krit., 1838, p. 720 f.) asserted that the speaker with tongues was always his own interpreter. He subsequently (St. u. Krit., 1860, p. 117 ff.) withdrew this extraordinary theory.

guages, instantaneously and without previous study, is as great as to receive the power to speak them. The anomaly in the miracle, merely to point out a suggestive discrepancy where all is anomalous, is that the gift of tongues should ever have been separated from the gift of interpretation. If a man understand the foreign language he speaks he can interpret it; if he cannot interpret it, he cannot understand it; and if he cannot understand it, can he possibly speak it? Certainly not, without his having been made a perfectly mechanical instrument through which, apart from the understanding and the will, sounds are involuntarily produced, which is not to be entertained. Still pursuing the same hypothesis,—the one gift is to speak languages which no one understands, the other to understand languages which no one speaks. Paul never even assumes the probability that the "tongue" spoken is understood by any one except the interpreter. The interpretation of such obscure tongues must have been a gift very little used,—never, indeed, except as the complement to the gift of tongues. The natural and useful facility in languages is apparently divided into two supernatural and useless halves. The idea is irresistibly suggested, as apparently it was to the Apostle himself, whether it would not have been more for the good of mankind and for the honour of Christianity, if, instead of these two miraculously incomplete gifts, a little natural good sense, five words even, to be spoken in the vernacular tongue and requiring no interpretation had been imparted. If, instead of foreign languages, we substitute the utterance of ecstatic religious excitement, the anomaly of speaking a language without understanding it or being understood becomes intelligible; and equally so the interpretation,

unaccompanied by the power of speaking. It is obvious in both cases that, as no one understands the tongue, no one can determine whether the interpretation of it be accurate or not. But it is easily conceivable that a sympathetic nervous listener might suppose that he understood the broken and incoherent speech of ecstasy and might interpret it according to his own stimulated imagination. The mysterious and unknown are suggestive texts, and there is nothing more infectious than religious excitement. In all this, however, is there anything miraculous?

We need not further demonstrate that the chief and general characteristic of "kinds of tongues," was that they were unintelligible (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 6-11, 13-19). Speaking with the spirit (πνεῦμα) is opposed to speaking with the understanding (νοῦς) (cf. vv. 14-16, &c). They were not only unintelligible to others, but the speaker himself did not understand what he uttered: v. 14. "For if I pray with a tongue (γλώσσῃ) my spirit (πνεῦμα) prayeth, but my understanding (νοῦς) is unfruitful" (cf. 15f. 19). We have already pointed out that Paul speaks of these Charismata in general, and not as affecting the Corinthians only; and we must now add that he obviously does not even insinuate that the "kinds of tongues" possessed by that community was a spurious Charisma, or that any attempt had been made to simulate the gift; for nothing could have been more simple than for the Apostle to denounce such phenomena as false, and to distinguish the genuine from the imitated speech with tongues. The most convincing proof that his remarks refer to the genuine Charisma is that the Apostle applies to himself the very same restrictions in the use of "tongues" as he enforces upon the Corinthians

(vv. 18-19, 6, &c), and characterises his own gift precisely as he does theirs (vv. 6, 11, 14, 15, 19).

Now what was the actual operation of this singular miraculous gift, and its utility whether as regards the community or the gifted individual? Paul restricts the speaking of "tongues" in church because, being unintelligible, it is not for edification (xiv. 2ff. 18f. 23, 27, 28). He himself does not make use of his gift for the assemblies of believers (vv. 6, 18). Another ground upon which he objects to the use of "kinds of tongues" in public is that all the gifted apparently speak at once (vv. 23, 27f. 33). It will be remembered that all the Charismata and their operations are described as due to the direct agency of the Holy Spirit (xii. 4ff.); and immediately following their enumeration, ending with "kinds of tongues" and "interpretation of tongues," the Apostle resumes: v. 11. "but all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each severally as he wills;" and in Acts ii. 4 the brethren are represented as speaking with tongues "as the Spirit gave them utterance." Now the first thought which presents itself is: How can a gift which is due to the direct working of the Holy Spirit possibly be abused? We must remember clearly that the speech is not expressive of the understanding of the speaker. The πνευματικοί spoke under the inspiration of the Supernatural Agent, what neither they nor others understood. Is it permissible to suppose that the Holy Spirit could inspire speech with tongues at an unfitting time? Can we imagine that this Spirit can actually have prompted many people to speak at one and the same time to the utter disturbance of order? Is not such a gift of tongues more like the confusion of tongues in Babel[1]

[1] Cf. *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, ii. p. 72 f.

than a christian Charisma? "And the Lord said: . . . . . Go to, let us go down and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech."[1] In spite of his abstract belief in the divine origin of the Charisma, Paul's language unconsciously betrays practical doubt as to its character. Does not such sarcasm as the following seem extremely indecorous when criticising a result produced directly by the Holy Spirit? (xiv. 23) "If, therefore, the whole church be come into one place and all speak with tongues, and there come in unlearned and unbelieving persons will they not say that ye are mad?" At Pentecost such an assembly was supposed to be drunken.[2] The whole of the counsel of the Apostle upon this occasion really amounts to an injunction to quench the Spirit. It is quite what might be expected in the case of the excitement of ecstatic religion, that the strong emotion should principally find vent in the form of prayer and praise (vv. 15ff.), equally so that it should be unintelligible and that no one should know when to say "Amen" (v. 16), and that all should speak at once, and still more so that the practical result should be tumult (vv. 23, 33). All this, it might appear, could be produced without the intervention of the Holy Spirit. So far, is there any utility in the miracle?

But we are told that it is "for a sign." Paul argues upon this point in a highly eccentric manner. He quotes (v. 21) Isaiah xxviii. 11, 12, in a form neither agreeing with the Septuagint nor with the Hebrew, a passage which has merely a superficial and verbal analogy with the gift of tongues, but whose real histo-

[1] Gen. xi. 6, 7.

[2] The same gift, it is generally understood, is referred to in Ephes. v. 18 ff.

rical meaning has no reference to it whatever: "In the Law it is written, that with men of other tongues and with the lips of others will I speak unto this people; and yet for all that they will not hear me, saith the Lord." The Apostle continues with singular logic: "So that (ὥστε) the tongues are for a sign (εἰς σημεῖον) not to those who believe but to the unbelieving; but prophecy is not for the unbelieving but for those who believe. If, therefore, the whole church be come into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in unlearned or unbelieving persons, will they not say that ye are mad? But if all prophesy and there come in an unbeliever . . . . . he is convicted by all . . . . . and so falling on his face he will worship God, reporting that God is indeed in you." The Apostle himself shows that the tongues can scarcely be considered a sign by unbelievers, upon whom, apparently, they produce no other impression than that the speakers are mad or drunken. Under any circumstances, the "kinds of tongues" described by the Apostle are a very sorry specimen of the "signs and wonders and powers" of which we have heard so much. It is not surprising that the Apostle prefers exhortation in a familiar tongue. In an ecstatic state, men are incapable of edifying others: we shall presently see how far they can edify themselves. Paul utters the pith of the whole matter at the very outset of his homily, when he prefers exhortation to kinds of tongues: v. 2. "For he that speaketh with a tongue speaketh not unto men but unto God: for no one understandeth, but in Spirit he speaketh mysteries" (λαλεῖ μυστήρια). It is scarcely possible to avoid feeling an impression of the suppressed impatience with which the Apostle deals with the whole subject. His mind was too prone to believe in spiritual mysteries, and his nervous

nature too susceptible to religious emotion and enthusiasm to permit him clearly to recognize the true character of the gift of "tongues;" but his good sense asserted itself and, after protesting that he would rather speak five words with his understanding than ten thousand words in a tongue, he breaks off with the characteristic exclamation (v. 20): "Brethren, become not children in your minds" (*μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν*). The advice is not yet out of place in the Epistle.

What was the private utility or advantage of the supernatural gift? How did he who spoke with a tongue edify himself? (v. 4.) Paul clearly states that he does not edify the church (vv. 2ff.). In the passage just quoted the Apostle, however, says that the speaker "with a tongue" "speaketh to God"; and further on (vv. 18, 19) he implies that, although he himself does not use the gift in public, he does so in private. He admonishes (v. 28) any one gifted with tongues, if there be no interpreter present, to "keep silence in a church, but let him speak to himself and to God." But in what does the personal edification of the individual consist? In employing language, which he does not comprehend, in private prayer and praise? In addressing God in some unintelligible jargon, in the utterance of which his understanding has no part? Many strange purposes and proceedings have been attributed to the Supreme Being, but probably none has been imagined more incongruous than a gift of tongues unsuitable for the edification of others, and not intelligible to the recipient, but considered an edifying substitute in private devotion for his own language. This was certainly not the form of prayer which Jesus taught his disciples.[1] And this gift was valued

[1] Mt. vi. 5 ff.; Luke xi. 1 ff.

more highly in the Corinthian Church than all the rest! Do we not get an instructive insight into the nature of the other Charismata from this suggestive fact? The reality of miracles does not seem to be demonstrated by these chapters.[1]

We have already stated that the vast majority of critics explain γλώσσαις λαλεῖν as speech in an ecstatic condition;[2] and all the phenomena described by Paul closely correspond with the utterance of persons in a state of extreme religious enthusiasm, and excitement, of which many illustrations might be given from other religions before and since the commencement of our era, as well as in the history of Christianity in early and recent times. Every one knows of the proceedings of the heathen oracles, the wild writhings and cries of the Pythoness and the mystic utterances of the Sibyl. In the Old Testament there is allusion to the ecstatic emotion of the prophets in the account of Saul, 1 Sam. xix. 24; cf. Isaiah viii. 19, xxix. 4. The Montanists exhibited similar phenomena, and Tertullian has recorded several instances of such religious excitement, to which we have elsewhere referred. Chrysostom had to repress paroxysms of pious excitement closely resembling these in the fourth century;[3] and even down to our own times instances have never been wanting of this form of hysterical religion. Into none of this can we enter here. Enough, we trust, has been said to show the true character of the supposed supernatural Charismata of Paul from his own account of them, and the information contained in his epistles.

[1] It is impossible to refer to every writer by whom the arguments adopted throughout this section may have been used or suggested, but we very gladly express our obligation, especially to the writings of Baur, Zeller, Meyer, Reuss, Overbeck, Holfzmann, and Neander, referred to higher up (note 1, p. 366). [2] Note 1, p. 366. [3] Hom. in Is., vi. 2.

Although we have been forced to examine in considerable detail the passages in the writings of Paul cited by apologists in support of miracles, the study is one of great value to our inquiry. These are the only passages which we possess in which a contemporary and eye-witness describes what he considers supernatural phenomena, and conveys to us his impression of miraculous agency. Instead of traditional reports of miracles narrated by writers who are unknown, and who did not witness the occurrences in question, we have here a trustworthy witness dealing with matters in which he was personally interested, and writing a didactic homily upon the nature and operation of Charismata, which he believed to be miraculous and conferred upon the Church by the immediate agency of the Holy Spirit. The nineteenth century here comes into direct contact with the age of miracles, but at the touch the miracles vanish, and that which, seen through the golden mist of pious tradition, seems to possess unearthly power and beauty, on closer examination dwindles into the prose of every day life. The more minutely reported miracles are scanned, the more unreal they are recognized to be. The point to which we now desire to call attention, however, is the belief and the mental constitution of Paul. We have seen something of the nature and operation of the gift of tongues. That the phenomena described proceeded from an ecstatic state, into which persons of highly excitable nervous organization are very liable to fall under the operation of strong religious impressions, can scarcely be doubted. Eminent apologists[1] have gravely illustrated the phenomena by the analogy of mesmerism, som-

[1] Bleek, Olshausen, and others.

nambulism and the effects of magnetism. Paul asserts that he was subject to the influence, whatever it was, more than anyone, and there is nothing which is more credible than the statement, or more characteristic of the Apostle. We desire to speak of him with the profoundest respect and admiration. We know more, from his epistles, of the intimate life and feelings of the great Apostle of the Gentiles than of any other man of the apostolic age, and it is impossible not to feel warm sympathy with his noble and generous character. The history of Christianity, after the death of its Founder, would sink almost into common-place if the grand figure of Paul were blotted from its pages. But it is no detraction to recognize that his nervous temperament rendered him peculiarly susceptible of those religious impressions which result in conditions of ecstatic trance, to which, as we actually learn from himself, he was exceptionally subject. The effects of this temperament probably first made him a Christian; and to his enthusiastic imagination we owe most of the supernatural dogmas of the religion which he adopted and transformed. One of these trances the Apostle himself recounts,[1] always with the cautious reserve: "whether in the body or out of the body I know not, God knoweth," how he was caught up to the third heaven, and in Paradise heard unutterable words which it is not lawful for a man to speak; in immediate connection with which he continues: "And lest I should be exalted above measure by the excess of the revelations, there was given to me a stake (σκόλοψ) in the flesh, an angel of Satan to buffet me"[2] This was one of

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff.

[2] 2 Cor. xii. 7. We need not discuss the connection of καὶ τῇ ὑπερβολῇ. We have adopted that which is also the reading of the A. V.

the "visions (ὀπτασίας) and revelations (ἀποκαλύψεις) of the Lord" of which he speaks, and of which he had such an excess to boast. Can any one doubt that this was nearly akin to the state of ecstatic trance in which he spoke with tongues more than all the Corinthians? Does any one suppose that Paul, "whether in the body or out of the body," was ever actually caught up into "the third heaven," wherever that may be? or doubt that this was simply one of the pious hallucinations which visit those who are in such a state? If we are seriously to discuss the point,—it is clear that evidence of such a thing is out of the question; that Paul himself admits that he cannot definitely describe what happened; that we have no other ground for considering the matter than the Apostle's own mysterious utterance; that it is impossible for a person subject to such visions and hallucinations to distinguish between reality and seeming; that this narrative has not only all the character of hallucination, but no feature of sober fact; and finally that, whilst it accords with all experiences of visionary hallucination, it contradicts all experience of practical life. We have seen that Paul believes in the genuineness and supernatural origin of the divine Charismata, and he in like manner believes in the reality of his visions and revelations. He has equal reason, or want of reason, in both cases. What, however, was the nature of the "stake in the flesh" which, upon the theory of the diabolical origin of disease, he calls "an angel of Satan to buffet me"? There have been many conjectures offered, but one explanation which has been advanced by able critics has special force and probability. It is suggested that this "stake in the flesh," which almost all now at

least recognise to have been some physical malady and very many suppose to have been headache or some other similar periodical and painful affection, was in reality a form of epilepsy.[1] It has been ably argued that the representation of the malady as "an angel of Satan" to buffet him, directly connects it with nervous disorders like epilepsy, which the Jews especially ascribed to diabolical influence; and the mention of this σκόλοψ in immediate continuation of his remarks on "visions" and "revelations," which a tendency to this very malady would so materially assist in producing, further confirms the conjecture.[2] No one can deny, and medical and psychological annals prove, that many men have been subject to visions and hallucinations which have never been seriously attributed to supernatural causes. There is not one single valid reason removing the ecstatic visions and trances of the Apostle Paul from this class. We do not yet discuss the supposed vision in which he saw the risen Jesus, though it is no exception to the rest, but reserve it for the next chapter. At present, it suffices that we point out the bearing of our examination of Paul's general testimony to miracles upon our future consideration of his evidence for the Resurrection. If it be admitted that his judgment as to the miraculous character of the Charismata is fallacious, and that what he considered miraculous were simply natural phenomena, the theory of the reality of miracles

[1] *Ewald*, Sendschr. des Ap. Paulus, p. 307 f.; *Hausrath*, Der Ap. Paulus, p. 52 ff.; *Hofmann*, Die heil. Schr. N. T., 1866, ii. 3, p. 309; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. des Paulus, u. s. w., p. 85 ff.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 186 ff.; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 302; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 542 f.

[2] *Holsten*, Zum Ev. des Paulus u. des Petrus, 1868, p. 85 f.

becomes less tenable than ever. And if, further, it be recognized, as we think it necessarily must be, that Paul was subject to natural ecstatic trances, with all their accompanying forms of nervous excitement: "kinds of tongues," visions, and religious hallucinations, a strong and clear light will fall upon his further testimony for miraculous occurrences which we shall shortly have before us.

PART III.

THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION.

CHAPTER I.

THE RELATION OF EVIDENCE TO SUBJECT.

When the evidence of the Gospels regarding the great central dogmas of ecclesiastical Christianity is shown to be untrustworthy and insufficient, apologists appeal with confidence to the testimony of the Apostle Paul. We presume that it is scarcely necessary to show that, in fact, the main weight of the case rests upon his epistles, as undoubted documents of the apostolic age, written some thirty or forty years after the death of the Master. The retort has frequently been made to the earlier portion of this work that, so long as the evidence of Paul remains unshaken, the apologetic position is secure. We may quote a few lines from an able work, part of a passage discussed in the preceding chapter, as a statement of the case: "In the first place, merely as a matter of historical attestation, the Gospels are not the strongest evidence for the Christian miracles. Only one of the four, in its present shape, is claimed as the work of an Apostle, and of that the genuineness is disputed. The Acts of the Apostles stand upon very much the

same footing with the Synoptic Gospels, and of this book, we are promised a further examination. But we possess at least some undoubted writings of one who was himself a chief actor in the events which followed immediately upon those recorded in the Gospels; and in these undoubted writings St. Paul certainly shows by incidental allusions, the good faith of which cannot be questioned, that he believed himself to be endowed with the power of working miracles, and that miracles, or what were thought to be such, were actually wrought by him and by his contemporaries. . . . . Besides these allusions, St. Paul repeatedly refers to the cardinal miracles of the Resurrection and Ascension; he refers to them as notorious and unquestionable facts at a time when such an assertion might have been easily refuted. On one occasion he gives a very circumstantial account of the testimony on which the belief in the Resurrection rested (1 Cor. xv. 4-8). And not only does he assert the Resurrection as a fact, but he builds upon it a whole scheme of doctrine: 'If Christ be not risen,' he says, 'then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain.' We do not stay now to consider the exact philosophical weight of this evidence. It will be time enough to do this when it has received the critical discussion that may be presumed to be in store for it. But as external evidence, in the legal sense, it is probably the best that can be produced, and it has been entirely untouched so far."[1] We have already disposed of the "allusions" above referred to. We shall in due time deal with the rest of the statements in this passage, but at present it is sufficient to agree at

[1] *Sanday*, The Gospels in the Second Century, 1876, p. 10 f.

least with the remark that, "as external evidence," the testimony of Paul "is probably the best that can be produced." We know at least who the witness really is, which is an advantage denied us in the case of the Gospels. It would be premature to express surprise, however, that we find the case of miracles and more especially of such stupendous miracles as the Resurrection and Ascension, practically resting upon the testimony of a single witness. The thought will intrude itself, but cannot at present be pursued.

The allegation which we have to examine is that the Founder of Christianity, after being dead and buried, rose from the dead and did not again die, but after remaining sometime with his disciples ascended with his body into heaven.[1] It is unnecessary to complicate the question by adding the other doctrines regarding the miraculous birth and divine origin and personality of Jesus. In the problem before us, certain objective facts are asserted which admit of being judicially tested. We have nothing to do here with the vague modern representation of these events, by means of which the objective facts vanish, and are replaced by subjective impressions and tricks of consciousness or symbols of spiritual life. Those who adopt such views have, of course, abandoned all that is real and supernatural in the supposed events. The Resurrection and Ascension which we have to deal with are events precisely as objective and real as the

[1] In the Articles of the Church of England this is expressed as follows: Art. ii. ". . . . . who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, &c., &c." Art. iii. "As Christ died for us, and was buried; so also it is to be believed that He went down into Hell." Art. iv. "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His Body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day."

death and burial,—no ideal process figured by the imagination or embodiments of christian hope, but tangible realities, historical occurrences in the sense of ordinary life. If Jesus, after being crucified, dead and buried, did not physically rise again from the dead, and in the flesh,[1] without again dying, "ascend into Heaven," the whole case falls to the ground. These incidents, although stupendous miracles, must also have been actual occurrences. They must have been simply historical in order to be miraculous. If they did not really take place, our task is at an end. If it be asserted that they really did take place their occurrence must be attested by adequate evidence. Apologists, whilst protesting that the occurrences in question are believed upon ordinary historical evidence, and that Christianity requires no indulgence, but submits itself to the same tests as any other affirmation, do not practically act upon this principle, we think; but, as soon as it is enunciated, introduce a variety of special pleas which remove the case from the domain of history into that of theology, and proceed upon one assumption after another until the fundamental facts become enveloped and, so to say, protected from judicial criticism by a cloud of religious dogmas and hypotheses.[2] By confining our attention to the simple facts, which form the basis of the whole superstructure of ecclesiastical

[1] The disappearance of the body from the sepulchre, a point much insisted upon, could have had no significance or reality if the body did not rise and afterwards ascend.

[2] A work of this kind may be mentioned in illustration: Dr. Westcott's "Gospel of the Resurrection." The argument of this work is of unquestionable ability, but it is chiefly remarkable, we think, for the manner in which the direct evidence is hurried over, and a mass of assertions and assumptions, the greater part of which is utterly untenable and inadmissible, is woven into specious and eloquent pleading, and does duty for substantial testimony.

Christianity we may avoid much confusion of ideas, and restrict the field of inquiry to reasonable limits. We propose, therefore, to limit our investigation to the evidence for the reality of the Resurrection and Ascension.

What evidence could be regarded as sufficient to establish the reality of such supposed occurrences? The question is one which demands the serious attention and consideration of every thoughtful man. It is not too much to say that, as a general rule, the Resurrection and Ascension are mere doctrines transmitted from one generation to another, believed as a matter of course, and rarely or never analysed and adopted by the understanding of those who profess to believe them. It is obvious that the amount of evidence requisite to satisfy our minds as to the truth of any statement should be measured by the nature of the statement made and, we may as well add, by its practical importance to ourselves. The news that a man was married or a child born last week is received without doubt, because men are married, and children are born every day; and although such pieces of gossip are frequently untrue, nothing appears more natural or in accordance with our experience. If we take more distant and less familiar events we have no doubt that a certain monarch was crowned, and that he subsequently died some centuries ago. If we ask for the evidence for the statement, nothing may be forthcoming of a very minute or indubitable nature. No absolute eye-witness of the coronation may have left a clear and detailed narrative of the ceremony; and possibly there may no longer be extant a sufficiently attested document proving with certainty the death of the monarch. There are several considerations, however, which make us perfectly satisfied with the evidence, incomplete as it may be.

Monarchs are generally crowned and invariably die; and the statement that any one particular monarch was crowned and died is so completely in conformity with experience, that we have no hesitation in believing it in the specific case. We are satisfied to believe such ordinary statements upon very slight evidence, both because our experience prepares us to believe that they are true, and because we do not much care whether they are true or not. If succession to an estate, or even life, depended upon either event, the demand for evidence, even in such simple matters, would be immensely intensified. The converse of the statement, however, would not meet with the same reception. Would anyone believe the affirmation that Alfred the Great, for instance, did not die at all? What amount of evidence would be required before such a statement could be pronounced sufficiently attested? Universal experience would be so uniformly opposed to the assertion that such a phenomenon had taken place, that probably no evidence which could readily be conceived possible could ensure the belief of more than a credulous few. The assertion that a man actually died and was buried, and yet afterwards rose from the dead, is still more at variance with human experience. The prolongation of life to long periods is comparatively consistent with experience; and if a life extending to several centuries be incredible it is only so in degree, and is not absolutely contrary to the order of nature, which certainly under present conditions does not favour the supposition of such lengthened existence, but still does not fix hard and fast limits to the life of man. The resurrection of a man who has once been absolutely dead, however, is not only contrary to all human experience, but is a direct breach of firmly established laws of nature.

If to this we add the assertion that the person so raised from the dead never again died, but after continuing some time longer on earth, ascended bodily to some invisible and inconceivable place called Heaven, there to "sit at the right hand of God," the shock to reason and common sense becomes so extreme, that it is difficult even to realize the nature of the affirmation.

It would be hopeless to endeavour to define the evidence which could establish the reality of the alleged occurrences. As the central doctrines of a religion upon which the salvation of the human race is said to depend, we are too deeply interested to be satisfied with slight evidence or no evidence at all. It has not unfrequently been made a reproach that forensic evidence is required of the reality of Divine Revelation. Such a course is regarded as perfectly preposterous, whether the test be applied to the primary assertion that a revelation has been made at all, or to its contents. What kind of evidence then are we permitted decorously to require upon so momentous a subject? Apparently just so much as apologists can conveniently set before us, and no more. The evidence deemed necessary for the settlement of a Scotch Peerage case, or a disputed will, is, we do not hesitate to say, infinitely more complete than that which it is thought either pious or right to expect in the case of Religion. The actual occurrence of the Resurrection and Ascension, however, is certainly a matter of evidence and, to retort, it is scarcely decent that any man should be required to believe what is so opposed to human experience, upon more imperfect evidence than is required for the transfer of land or the right of a title, simply because ecclesiastical dogmas are founded upon them, and it is represented that unless they be true "our hope is vain."

The testimony requisite to establish the reality of such a stupendous miracle can scarcely be realized. Proportionately it should be as unparalleled in its force as those events are in fact. One point, moreover, must never be forgotten. Human testimony is exceedingly fallible at its best. It is liable to error from innumerable causes, and most of all, probably, when religious excitement is present, and disturbing elements of sorrow, fear, doubt, or enthusiasm interfere with the calmness of judgment. When any assertion is made which contradicts unvarying experience, upon evidence which experience knows to be universally liable to error, there cannot be much hesitation in disbelieving the assertion and preferring belief in the order of nature. And when evidence proceeds from an age not only highly exposed to error, from ignorance of natural laws, superstition, and religious excitement, but prolific in fabulous reports and untenable theories, it cannot be received without the gravest suspicion. We make these brief remarks, in anticipation, as nothing is more essential in the discussion upon which we are about to enter than a proper appreciation of the allegations which are to be tested, and of the nature of the testimony required for their belief.

We shall not limit our inquiry to the testimony of Paul, but shall review the whole of the evidence adduced for the Resurrection and Ascension. Hitherto, our examination of the historical books of the New Testament has been mainly for the purpose of ascertaining their character, and the value of their evidence for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation. It is unnecessary for us here minutely to recapitulate the results. The Acts of the Apostles, we have shown, cannot be received as testimony of the slightest weight upon any of the points

before us. Written by an unknown author, who was not an eye-witness of the miracles related; who describes events not as they occurred, but as his pious imagination supposed they ought to have occurred; who seldom touches history without transforming it by legend until the original elements can scarcely be distinguished; who puts his own words and sentiments into the mouths of the Apostles and other persons of his narrative; and who represents almost every phase of the Church in the Apostolic age as influenced, or directly produced, by means of supernatural agency; such a work is of no value as evidence for occurrences which are in contradiction to all human experience. Briefly to state the case of the Gospels in other words than our own, we repeat the honest statement of the able writer quoted at the beginning of this chapter: "In the first place, merely as a matter of historical attestation, the Gospels are not the strongest evidence for the Christian miracles. Only one of the four, in its present shape, is claimed as the work of an Apostle, and of that the genuineness is disputed." [1] We may add that the third Synoptic does not, in the estimation of any one who has examined the Acts of the Apostles, gain additional credibility by being composed by the same author as the latter work. The writers of the four Gospels are absolutely unknown to us, and in the case of three of them, it is not even affirmed that they were eye-witnesses of the Resurrection and Ascension and other miracles narrated. The undeniably doubtful authorship of the fourth Gospel, not to make a more positive statement here, renders this work, which was not written until upwards of half a century, at the very least, after the death of Jesus, incapable of proving anything in regard to the Resurrection

[1] *Sanday*, The Gospels in the Second Century, p. 10.

and Ascension. A much stronger statement might be made, but we refer readers to our former volumes, and we shall learn something more of the character of the Gospel narratives as we proceed. Although we cannot attach any value as evidence to the Gospels, we propose, before taking the testimony of Paul, to survey the various statements made by them regarding the astounding miracles we are discussing. Enough has been said to show that we cannot accept any statement as true simply because it is made by a Gospel or Gospels. When it is related in the first Synoptic, for instance, that Pilate took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, "I am innocent of this man's blood: see ye to it," [1]—an incident to which no reference, be it said in passing, is made by the other evangelists, although it is sufficiently remarkable to have deserved notice,—we cannot of course assume that Pilate actually said or did anything of the kind. A comparison of the various accounts of the Resurrection and Ascension, however, and careful examination of their details, will be of very great use, by enabling us to appreciate the position of the case apart from the evidence of Paul. The indefinite impression fostered by apologists, that the evidence of the Gospels supplements and completes the evidence of the Apostle, and forms an aggregate body of testimony of remarkable force and volume, must be examined, and a clear conception formed of the whole case.

One point may at once be mentioned before we enter upon our examination of the Gospels. The Evangelists narrate such astonishing occurrences as the Resurrection and Ascension with perfect composure and absence of surprise. This characteristic is even made an argument

[1] Mt. xxvii. 24.

for the truth of their narrative. The impression made upon our minds, however, is the very reverse of that which apologists desire us to receive. The writers do not in the least degree seem to have realised the exceptional character of the occurrences they relate, and betray the assurance of persons writing in an ignorant and superstitious age, whose minds have become too familiar with the supernatural to be at all surprised either by a resurrection from the dead or a bodily ascension. Miracles in their eyes have lost their strangeness and seem quite common-place. It will be seen as we examine the narratives that a stupendous miracle, or a convulsion of nature, is thrown in by one or omitted by another as a mere matter of detail. An earthquake or the resurrection of many bodies of saints are mere trifles which can be inserted without wonder or omitted without regret. The casual and momentary expression of hesitation to believe, which is introduced, is evidently nothing more than a rhetorical device or artistic touch to heighten the reality of the scene. It would have been infinitely more satisfactory had we been able to perceive that these witnesses, instead of being genuine denizens of the age of miracles, had really understood the astounding nature of the occurrences they report, and did not consider a miracle the most natural thing in the world.

CHAPTER II.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE GOSPELS.

In order more fully to appreciate the nature of the narratives which the four evangelists give of the last hours of the life of Jesus, we may take them up at the point where, mocked and buffeted by the Roman soldiers, he is finally led away to be crucified. Let no one suppose that, in freely criticising the Gospels, we regard without deep emotion the actual incidents which lie at the bottom of these narratives. No one can form to himself any adequate conception of the terrible sufferings of the Master, maltreated and insulted by a base and brutal multitude, too degraded to understand his noble character, and too ignorant to appreciate his elevated teaching, without keen pain; and to follow his course from the tribunal which sacrificed him to Jewish popular clamour to the spot where he ended a brief but self-sacrificing life by the horrible and shameful death of a slave upon the cross may well make indignant sympathy take the place of criticism. Profound veneration for the great Teacher, however, and earnest interest in all that concerns his history rather command serious and unhesitating examination of the statements made with regard to him, than discourage an attempt to ascertain the truth; and it would be anything but respect for his memory to accept without question the Gospel accounts of his life simply

because they were composed with the desire to glorify him.

According to the Synoptics, when Jesus is led away to be crucified, the Roman guard entrusted with the duty of executing the cruel sentence find a man of Cyrene, Simon by name, and compel him to carry the cross.[1] It was customary for those condemned to crucifixion to carry the cross, or at least the main portion of it, themselves to the place of execution, and no explanation is given by the Synoptists for the deviation from this practice which they relate. The fourth Gospel, however, does not appear to know anything of this incident or of Simon of Cyrene, but distinctly states that Jesus bore his own cross.[2] On the way to Golgotha, according to the third Gospel, Jesus is followed by a great multitude of the people, and of women who were bewailing and lamenting him, and he addresses to them a few prophetic sentences.[3] We might be surprised at the singular fact that there is no reference to this incident in any other Gospel, and that words of Jesus, so weighty in themselves and spoken at so supreme a moment, should not elsewhere have been recorded, but for the fact that, from internal evidence, the address must be assigned to a period subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem. The other evangelists may, therefore, well ignore it. It was

[1] Mt. xxvii. 32; Mk. xv. 21; Luke xxiii. 26.

[2] *βαστάζων ἑαυτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν*, John xix. 17. If instead of this reading, which is that of the Sinaitic and Alexandrian codices and other authorities, adopted by Tischendorf and others, the *τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ* of the received text and Lachmann, or *αὐτῷ τ. στ.*, of B, X, &c., be preferred, the result is the same. We may mention, in passing, that the fourth Gospel has no reference to a saying ascribed by the Synoptics to Jesus, in which bearing his cross is used typically: Mt. x. 38, xvi. 24; Mk. viii. 34, x. 21; Luke ix. 23, xiv. 27.

[3] Luke xxiii. 27 ff.; cf. xxi. 23; Mt. xxiv. 19.

the custom to give those about to be crucified a draught of wine containing some strong opiate which in some degree alleviated the intense suffering of that mode of death. Mark[1] probably refers to this (xv. 23) when he states that, on reaching the place of execution, "they gave him wine (οἶνον) mingled with myrrh." The fourth Gospel has nothing of this. Matthew says (xxvii. 34): "They gave him vinegar (ὄξος) to drink mingled with gall"[2] (μετὰ χολῆς). If, instead of ὄξος with the Alexandrian and a majority of MSS., we read οἶνος, "wine," with the Sinaitic, Vatican, and some other ancient codices, this is a curious statement, and is well worthy of a moment's notice as suggestive of the way in which these narratives were written. The conception of a suffering Messiah, it is well known, was more particularly supported, by New Testament writers, by attributing a Messianic character to Ps. xxii., lxix., and Isaiah liii., and throughout the narrative of the Passion we are perpetually referred to these and other Scriptures as finding their fulfilment in the sufferings of Jesus. The first Synoptist found in Ps. lxix. 21 (Sept. lxviii. 21): "They gave me also gall (χολὴν) for my food, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar (ὄξος) to drink;" and apparently in order to make the supposed fulfilment correspond as closely as possible, he combined the "gall" of the food with the vinegar or wine in strangely literal fashion,[3] very characteristic, however, of

[1] We shall, for the sake of brevity, call the Gospels by the names assigned to them in the Canon.

[2] There have been many attempts to explain away χολή, and to make it mean either a species of Vermuth or any bitter substance (*Olshausen*, Leidengesch., 168); but the great mass of critics rightly retain its meaning, "Gall." So Ewald, Meyer, Bleek, Strauss, Weisse, Schenkel, Volkmar, Alford, Wordsworth, &c., &c.

[3] "St. Matthew mentally refers it to Ps. lxix. 21 ὄξος (or *possibly* οἶνον, which Tischendorf admits from ℵ, B, D, K, L, &c.) μετὰ χολῆς." *Farrar*,

the whole of the evangelists. Luke, who seems not to have understood the custom known perhaps to Mark, represents (xxiii. 36) the soldiers as mocking Jesus by "offering him vinegar"[1] (ὄξος); he omits the gall, but probably refers to the same Psalm without being so falsely literal as Matthew.

We need not enter into the discussion as to the chronology of the Passion week, regarding which there is so much discrepancy in the accounts of the fourth Gospel and of the Synoptics, nor shall we pause minutely to deal with the irreconcilable difference which, it is admitted,[2] exists in their statement of the hours at which the events of the last fatal day occurred. The fourth Gospel (xix. 4) represents Pilate as bringing Jesus forth to the Jews "about the sixth hour" (noon). Mark (xv. 25), in obvious agreement with the other Synoptics as further statements prove, distinctly says: "And it was the third hour (9 o'clock a.m.), and they crucified him." At the sixth hour (noon), according to the three Synoptists, there was darkness over the earth till about the ninth hour (3 o'clock p.m.), shortly after which time

Life of Christ, ii. p. 400, note 1.

[1] Luke omits the subsequent offer of "vinegar" (probably the *Posca* of the Roman soldiers) mentioned by the other Evangelists. We presume the reference in xxiii. 36 to be the same as the act described in Mt. xxvii. 34 and Mk. xv. 23.

[2] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 426 f., 897 f.; *Brückner*, zu de Wette's Ev. u. Br. Johannes, 5te aufl., 1862, p. 305; *Hase*, Das Leben Jesu, p. 253; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., 1872, iii. p. 395 f., anm. 4; *Lücke* Comm. Ev. des Johannes, ii. 1843, p. 754 ff.; *Luthardt*, Das johann. Evang. 2te Aufl., ii. p. 463 ff.; *Meyer*, Ev. des Johannes, 5te Aufl., p. 622 ff; Ev. des Matth., p. 596; *Neander*, Das Leb. Jesu, 7te Aufl., p. 580, anm. 3; *Scholten*, Het Ev. naar Johannes, 1864, p. 331 f.; *Weizsäcker*, Unters. ev. Gesch., p. 567, anm. 1; *De Wette*, Ev. u. Br. Johannes, p. 304 f. Cf. *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 385.1, 414.1. The common explanation of the discrepancy by supposing the author of the fourth Gospel to use "the Roman mode of reckoning time" no longer needs refutation.

Jesus expired.[1] As, according to the fourth Gospel, the sentence was not even passed before midday, and some time must be allowed for preparation and going to the place of execution, it is clear that there is a very wide discrepancy between the hours at which Jesus was crucified and died, unless, as regards the latter point, we take agreement in all as to the hour of death. In this case, commencing at the hour of the fourth Gospel and ending with that of the Synoptics, Jesus must have expired after being less than three hours on the cross. According to the Synoptics, and also, if we assign a later hour for the death, according to the fourth Gospel, he cannot have been more than six hours on the cross. We shall presently see that this remarkably rapid death has an important bearing upon the history and the views formed regarding it. It is known that crucifixion, besides being the most shameful mode of death, and indeed chiefly reserved for slaves and the lowest criminals, was one of the most lingering and atrociously cruel punishments ever invented by the malignity of man. Persons crucified, it is stated and admitted,[2] generally lived for at least twelve hours, and sometimes even survived the excruciating tortures of the cross for three days. We shall not further anticipate remarks which must hereafter be made regarding this.

We need not do more than point out that no two of the Gospels agree upon so simple, yet important, a point as the inscription on the cross.[3] It is argued that "a close

[1] Mt. xxvii. 45 f.; Mk. xv. 33 f.; Luke xxiii. 44 f.

[2] *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 585; *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 423, 427, n. 2; *Godet*, Comm. sur l'Ev. de St. Jean, 1865, ii. p. 610; *Luthardt*, Das joh. Evang., ii. p. 470; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, xiiime éd., p. 438; *Winer*, Realwörterb., i. p. 679.

[3] Cf. Mt. xxvii. 37; Mk. xv. 26; Luke xxiii. 38; John xix. 19.

examination of the narratives furnishes no sufficient reason for supposing that all proposed to give the same or the entire inscription," and, after some curious reasoning, it is concluded that "there is at least no possibility of showing any inconsistency on the strictly literal interpretation of the words of the evangelist."[1] On the contrary, we had ventured to suppose that, in giving a form of words said to have been affixed to the cross, the evangelists intended to give the form actually used, and consequently "the same" and "entire inscription," which must have been short; and we consider it quite inconceivable that such was not their deliberate intention, however imperfectly fulfilled.

We pass on merely to notice a curious point in connection with an incident related by all the Gospels. It is stated that the Roman soldiers who crucified Jesus divided his garments amongst them, casting lots to determine what part each should take. The clothing of criminals executed was the perquisite of the soldiers who performed the duty, and there is nothing improbable in the story that the four soldiers decided by lot the partition of the garments—indeed there is every reason to suppose that such was the practice. The incident is mentioned as the direct fulfilment of the Ps. xxii. 18, which is quoted literally from the Septuagint version (xxi. 18) by the Author of the fourth Gospel. He did not, however, understand the passage, or disregarded its true meaning,[2] and in order to make the incident accord

[1] *Westcott*, Int. to Study of the Gospels, 4th ed., p. 328, note 10.

[2] *Strauss*, Das Leben Jesu, 2te Aufl., 1864, p. 579 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, iii. p. 421, anm. 1; *Scholten*, Evang. naar Johannes, 1864, p. 334; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, xiiime éd., p. 524 f.; *Lücke*, Ev. des Johannes, ii. p. 761. Cf. *Hengstenberg*, Das Ev. des heil. Johannes, 2te Aufl., iii. p. 261 f.

better, as he supposed, with the prophetic Psalm, he represents that the soldiers amicably parted the rest of his garments amongst them without lot, but cast lots for the coat, which was without seam: xix. 24. "They said, therefore, among themselves: Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be; that the Scripture might be fulfilled: They parted my garments among them, and for my vesture they cast lots. These things, therefore, the soldiers did." The evangelist does not perceive that the two parts of the sentence in the Psalm really refer to the same action, but exhibits the partition of the garments and the lots for the vesture as separately fulfilled. The Synoptists apparently divide the whole by lot.[1] They do not expressly refer to the Psalm, however, except in the received text of Matth. xxvii. 35, into which and some other MSS. the quotation has been interpolated.[2] That the narrative of the Gospels, instead of being independent and genuine history, is constructed upon the lines of supposed Messianic Psalms and passages of the Old Testament, will become increasingly evident as we proceed.

It is stated by all the Gospels that two malefactors—the first and second calling them "robbers"—were crucified with Jesus, the one on the right hand and the other on the left. The statement in Mark xv. 28, that this fulfilled Isaiah liii. 12, which is found in our received text, is omitted by all the oldest codices, and is an interpolation,[3] but we shall hereafter have to speak of this point in connection with another matter, and we now

[1] Mt. xxvii. 35; Mk. xv. 24; Luke xxiii. 34.

[2] "Certainly an interpolation." *Westcott*, Int. to Study of Gospels, p. 325, n. 2.

[3] "Certainly an interpolation." *Westcott*, Ib. p. 326, n. 5.

merely point out that, though the verse was thus inserted here, it is placed in the mouth of Jesus himself by the third Synoptist (xxii. 37), and the whole passage from which it was taken has evidently largely influenced the composition of the narrative before us. According to the first and second Gospels,[1] the robbers joined with the chief priest and the scribes and elders and those who passed by in mocking and reviling Jesus. This is directly contradicted by the third Synoptist, who states that only one of the malefactors did so (xxiii. 39 ff.): "But the other answering rebuked him and said: Dost not thou even fear God seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we are receiving the due reward of our deeds; but this man did nothing amiss. And he said: Jesus, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom. And he said unto him: Verily, I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." It requires very little examination to detect that this story is legendary,[2] and cannot for a moment be maintained as historical. Those who dwell upon its symbolical character[3] do nothing to establish its veracity. This exemplary robber speaks like an Apostle, and in praying Jesus as the Messiah to remember him when he came into his kingdom, he shows much more than apostolic appreciation of the claims and character of Jesus. The

[1] Mt. xxvii. 44; Mk. xv. 32.

[2] *D'Eichthal*, Les Evangiles, 1863, ii. p. 311 f.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 578 f.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 348 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 425 f.; *Krüger-Velthusen*, Das Leb. Jesu, 1872, p. 251, anm.; *Schenkel*, Das Charakterb. Jesu, 1864, p. 308 f.; *Scholten*, Het paulin. Ev. p. 284 f.; *Schwegler*, Das nachap. Z., ii. p. 50 f.; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, Krit. bearb. 4te Aufl., 1840, ii. p. 518 ff.; Leb. Jesu, für d. deutsche Volk bearb. 2te Aufl., p. 582; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., ii. p. 180; *Zeller*, Theol. Jahrb. 1843, p. 78 f. Cf. *Weizsäcker*, Unters. ev. Gesch., p. 568.

[3] *Olshausen*, Bibl. Com., ii. 2, p. 172.

reply of Jesus, moreover, contains a statement not only wholly contradictory of Jewish belief as to the place of departed spirits, but of all Christian doctrine at the time as to the descent of Jesus into Hades. Into this, however, it is needless for us to go.[1] Not only do the other Gospels show no knowledge of so interesting an episode, but, as we have pointed out, the first and second Synoptics positively exclude it. We shall see, moreover, that there is a serious difficulty in understanding how this conversation on the cross, which is so exclusively the property of the third Synoptist, could have been reported to him.

The Synoptics represent the passers by and the chief priests, scribes, and elders, as mocking Jesus as he hung on the cross. The fourth Gospel preserves total silence as to all this. It is curious, moreover, that the mocking is based upon that described in the Psalm xxii., to which we have already several times had to refer. In v. 7 f. we have: "All they that see me laughed me to scorn: they shot out the lip; they shook the head (saying), 8. He trusted on the Lord, let him deliver him, let him save him (seeing) that he delighteth in him."[2] Compare with this Mt. xxvii. 39 ff., Mk. xv. 29 ff., Luke xxiii. 35. Is it possible to suppose that the chief priests and elders and scribes could actually have quoted the words of this Psalm, there put into the mouth of the Psalmist's enemies, as the first Synoptist represents (xxvii. 43)?[3] It is obvious that the speeches ascribed to the chief priests and elders can be nothing more than

[1] It is unnecessary for us to discuss the various ideas of which this episode is supposed to be symbolical.

[2] 7. Πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντές με ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με, ἐλάλησαν ἐν χείλεσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλήν, 8. Ἤλπισεν ἐπὶ Κύριον, ῥυσάσθω αὐτὸν, σωσάτω αὐτὸν, ὅτι θέλει αὐτόν. Ps. xxi. Sept. cf. vv. 4, 5.

[3] *Strauss*, Das Leben Jesu, p. 580 f.

the expressions which the writers considered suitable to them, and the fact that they seek their inspiration in a Psalm which they suppose to be Messianic is suggestive.

We have already mentioned that the fourth Gospel says nothing of any mocking speeches. The Author, however, narrates an episode (xix. 25-27) in which the dying Jesus is represented as confiding his mother to the care of "the disciple whom he loved," of which in their turn the Synoptists seem to be perfectly ignorant. We have already elsewhere remarked that there is no evidence whatever that there was any disciple whom Jesus specially loved, except the repeated statement in this Gospel. No other work of the New Testament contains a hint of such an individual, and much less that he was the Apostle John. The Synoptic Gospels do not confirm the claim to this distinction, and the Apostle Paul in no way allows us to suppose that he was aware of the existence of any particular preference on the part of Jesus to one of the disciples. Nor is there any evidence that any one of the disciples took the mother of Jesus to his own home. There is, therefore, no external confirmation of this episode; but there is, on the contrary, much which leads to the conclusion that it is not historical.[1] There has been much discussion as to whether four women are mentioned (xix. 25), or whether "his mother's sister" is represented as "Mary, the wife of Clopas," or was a different person. There are, we think, reasons for concluding that there were four, but in the doubt we shall not base any argument on the point. The Synoptics[2] distinctly state "the women that followed him from

[1] *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 423, anm. 1, 426; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, p. 525 ff.; *Schenkel*, Charakterb. Jesu, p. 311; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 585. Cf. *Weizsäcker*, Unters, ev. Gesch., p. 568.

[2] Mt. xxvii. 55 f.; Mk. xv. 40; Luke xxiii. 49.

Galilee," among which were "Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Joseph and the mother of Zebedee's sons,"[1] and, as the third Synoptic says, "all his acquaintance"[2] were standing "afar off" (μακρόθεν). They are unanimous in saying this, and there is every reason for supposing that they are correct.[3] This is consequently a contradiction of the account in the fourth Gospel that John and the women were standing "by the cross of Jesus." Olshausen, Lücke, and others, suggest that they subsequently came from a distance up to the cross, but the statement of the Synoptists is made at the close, and after this scene is supposed to have taken place. The opposite conjecture, that from standing close to the cross they removed to a distance has little to recommend it. Both explanations are equally arbitrary and unsupported by evidence.

It may be well, in connection with this, to refer to the various sayings and cries ascribed by the different evangelists to Jesus on the cross. We have already mentioned the conversation with the "penitent thief," which is peculiar to the third Gospel, and now that with the "beloved disciple," which is only in the fourth. The third Synoptic[4] states that, on being crucified, Jesus said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," a saying which is in the spirit of Jesus and worthy of him, but of which the other Gospels do not take any notice.[5] The fourth Gospel again has a cry (xix. 28): "After this, Jesus knowing that all things are now fulfilled, that the Scripture might be accomplished, saith:

[1] Mt. xxvii. 56; Mk. xv. 40. [2] Luke xxiii. 49.
[3] Cf. Mt. xxvi, 31, 56; Mk. xiv. 27. [4] xxiii. 34.
[5] Strauss calls attention to Isaiah liii. 12, where, of the servant of Jehovah, it is said that he "made intercession for the transgressors." Das Leben Jesu, p. 584.

I thirst."[1] The majority of critics[2] understand by this that "I thirst" is said in order "that the Scripture might be fulfilled" by the offer of the vinegar, related in the following verse. The Scripture referred to is of course Ps. lxix. 21: "They gave me also gall for my food, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar (ὄξος) to drink;" which we have already quoted in connection with Matth. xxvii. 34. The third Synoptic (xxiii. 36) represents the vinegar as being offered in mockery at a much earlier period, and Matthew and Mark[3] connect the offer of the vinegar with quite a different cry from that in the fourth Gospel, as we shall presently see. Nothing could be more natural than that, after protracted agony, the patient sufferer should cry: "I thirst," but the dogmatic purpose, which dictates the whole narrative in the fourth Gospel, is rendered obvious by the reference of such a cry to a supposed Messianic prophecy. This is further displayed by the statement (v. 29) that the sponge with vinegar was put "upon hyssop" (ὑσσώπῳ),—the two Synoptics have "on a reed" (καλάμῳ),—which the Author probably uses in association with the paschal lamb,[4] an idea present to his mind throughout the

[1] Μετὰ τοῦτο εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται, ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή, λέγει· Διψῶ.

[2] *Alford*, Gk. Test., i. p. 900 f.; *Brückner*, zu de Wette Ev. u. Br. Joh., p. 308; *Ewald*, Die johann. Schr., 1861, i. p. 412; *Godet*, Ev. de St. Jean, ii. p. 617; *Hengstenberg*, Ev. Johann., iii. p. 271; *Hofmann*, Schriftbeweis, ii. 1, p. 314; *Lücke*, Ev. Johann., ii. p. 764 f.; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 585; *de Wette*, Ev. u. Br. Johann., p. 307. Others connect "that the Scriptures might be fulfilled" with the preceding phrase; so *Luthardt*, Das joh. Ev., ii. p. 478; *Lange*, Ev. u. Johann, 2te Aufl., p. 405; *Meyer*, Ev. Johann., p. 631; *Scholten*, Ev. Johann., p. 338, n. 1.

[3] Mt. xxvii. 48 f.; Mk. xv. 36.

[4] Ex. xii. 22; cf. Levit. xiv. 4, 6, 49; *Hengstenberg*, Das Ev. Joh. iii. p. 273; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz. iii. p. 430, anm. 2; *Scholten*, Het Ev. Joh. p. 337. Cf. *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, p. 528.

passion. The first and second Synoptics [1] represent the last cry of Jesus to have been a quotation from Ps. xxii. 1: "Eli (or Mk., Eloi), Eli, lema sabacthani? that is to say: My God, my God, why didst thou forsake me?" This, according to them, evidently, was the last articulate utterance of the expiring Master, for they merely add that "when he cried again with a loud voice," Jesus yielded up his spirit.[2] Neither of the other Gospels has any mention of this cry. The third Gospel substitutes: "And when Jesus cried with a loud voice, he said: Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit, and having said this he expired." [3] This is an almost literal quotation from the Septuagint version of Ps. xxxi. 5. The fourth Gospel has a totally different cry (xix. 30), for, on receiving the vinegar, which accomplished the Scripture, he represents Jesus as saying: "It is finished" (Τετέλεσται), and immediately expiring. It will be observed that seven sayings are attributed to Jesus on the cross, of which the first two Gospels have only one, the third Synoptic three, and the fourth Gospel three. We do not intend to express any opinion here in favour of any of these, but we merely point out the remarkable fact that, with the exception of the one cry in the first two Synoptics, each Gospel has ascribed different sayings to the dying Master, and not only no two of them agree, but in some important instances the statement of the one evangelist seems absolutely to exclude the accounts of the others. Every one knows the hackneyed explanation of apologists, but in works which repeat each other so much elsewhere, it certainly is a curious phenomenon that there is so little

[1] Mt. xxvii. 46; Mk. xv. 34. [2] Mt. xxvii. 50; Mk. xv. 37.

[3] *καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν.* Luke xxiii. 46.

agreement here. If all the Master's disciples "forsook him and fled,"[1] and his few friends and acquaintances stood "afar off" regarding his sufferings, it is readily conceivable that pious tradition had unlimited play. We must, however, return to the cry recorded in Matthew and Mark,[2] the only one about which two witnesses agree. Both of them give this quotation from Ps. xxii. 1 in Aramaic: Eli (Mark: Eloi), Eli,[3] lema sabacthani. The purpose is clearly to enable the reader to understand what follows, which we quote from the first Gospel: "And some of them that stood there, when they heard it said: This man calleth for Elijah. . . . . The rest said, Let be, let us see whether Elijah is coming to save him."[4] It is impossible to confuse "*Eli*" or "*Eloi*" with "*Elijahu*,"[5] and the explanations suggested by apologists are not sufficient to remove a difficulty which seems to betray the legendary character of the statement. The mistake of supposing that Jesus called for Elijah could not possibly have been made by those who spoke Aramaic; that strangers not perfectly understanding Aramaic should be here intended cannot be maintained, for the suggestion is represented as adopted by "the rest." The Roman soldiers had probably never heard of Elijah; and there is nothing whatever to support the allegation of mockery[6] as accounting for the singular

[1] Mt. xxvi. 56. [2] Mt. xxvii. 46; Mk. xv. 34.

[3] The Sinaitic cod., Mt. xxvii. 46 reads: ἐλωὶ, ἐλωὶ, λεμὰ σαβαχθανεί; the cod. Alex., ἡλὶ, ἡλὶ, κ. τ. λ; cod. Vat., ἐλωεὶ, ἐλωεὶ, κ. τ. λ. D has ἡλεὶ, ἡλεὶ, κ.τ.λ. We only note the variations in the first two words which are those upon which the question turns.

[4] Mt. xxvii. 47, 49; cf. Mk. xv. 35, 36.

[5] *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 351 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 428, anm. 1.

[6] *Meyer* says: "Frevelhafter *Judenwitz* mit lappisch böslicher Verdrehung des ἡλί ἡλί, nicht *Missverständniss*, weder der Römischen Soldaten,

episode. The verse of the Psalm was too well known to the Jews to admit of any suggested play upon words.

The three Synoptics state that, from the sixth hour (mid-day) to the ninth (3 o'clock), "there was darkness over all the earth" (*σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν*).[1] The third Gospel adds: "the sun having failed" (*τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος*).[2] By the term "all the earth" some critics[3] maintain that the evangelist merely meant the Holy Land,[4] whilst others hold that he uses the expression in its literal sense.[5] The fourth gospel takes no notice of this darkness. Such a phenomenon is scarcely a trifle to be ignored in any account of the crucifixion, if it actually occured. The omission of all mention of it either amounts to a denial of its occurrence or betrays most suspicious familiarity with supernatural interference. There have been many efforts made to explain this darkness naturally, or at least to find some allusion to it in contemporary history, all of which have signally failed. As the moon was at the full, it is admitted that the darkness could not have been an eclipse.[6] The Fathers

noch gemeiner Juden, noch der Hellenisten, da der ganze Context Scenen des giftigen *Spottes* vorführt." Ev. des Matthäus, p. 599.

[1] Mt. xxvii. 45; Mk. xv. 33; Luke xxiii. 44.

[2] Luke xxiii. 45. This is the reading of the Sinaitic, and Vatican (*ἐκλείπ.*) codices. A reads *καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος.*

[3] *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 560; *Kuinoel*, Comm. in N. T., i. p. 795; *Lange*, Das Ev. Matth., p. 435; *Milman*, Hist of Chr., i. p. 335; *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., Four Gospels, p. 105.

[4] Dr. Farrar says: "It is quite possible that the darkness was a local gloom which hung densely over the guilty city and its immediate neighbourhood." Life of Christ, 5th ed., ii. p. 414.

[5] *Alford*, Gk. Test., i. p. 294, 427 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 438; *Meyer*, Ev. Matth., p. 359; *De Wette*, Ev. Matth. p. 359; *Weiss*, Marcusev., p. 499.

[6] *Alford*, Gk. Test., i. p. 294; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 581, anm. 4; *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 413 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 439; *Meyer*, Ev. Matth., p. 596; *Neander*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 574, anm. 1;

appealed to Phlegon the Chronicler, who mentions[1] an eclipse of the sun about this period accompanied by an earthquake, and also to a similar occurrence referred to by Eusebius,[2] probably quoted from the historian Thallus, but of course, modern knowledge has dispelled the illusion that these phenonomena have any connection with the darkness we are discussing, and the theory that the evangelists are confirmed in their account by this evidence is now generally abandoned.[3] It is apart from our object to show how common it was amongst classical and other writers to represent nature as sympathising with national or social disasters;[4] and as a poetical touch this remarkable darkness of the Synoptists, of which no one else knows anything, is quite intelligible. The statement, however, is as seriously and deliberately made as any other in their narrative, and does not add to its credibility. It is palpable that the account is mythical,[5] and it bears a strange likeness to passages in the Old Testament, from the imagery of which the representation in all probability was derived.[6]

The first and second Gospels state that when Jesus

Olshausen, Leidensgesch. des Herrn, 1862, p. 176; *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., Four Gospels, p. 105.

[1] xiii. Olympiadum. [2] Chron. ad Olymp., 202.

[3] *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 581, anm. 4; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 438 f.; *Meyer*, Ev. Matth., p. 596; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 335, note n.; *De Wette*, Ev. Matth., p. 359; *Wieseler*, Chron. synops. Evv., p. 387 f., &c., &c. Cf. *Farrar*, Life of Chr., ii. p. 414; *Neander*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 574, anm. 1.

[4] Cf. *Virgil*, Georg., i. 463—468; *Dio Cass.*, 40.17, 56.29; *Plin.* H. N., 2.30; *Plutarch*, V. Rom. § 27, p. 34; Cæs. § 69, p. 740 f.; *Wetstein*, *Grotius*, ad h. l.

[5] *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 349, 352 f.; *Hase*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 278 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 437 ff.; *Krüger-Velthusen*, Das Leb. Jesu, 1872, p. 252 f.; *Schleiermacher*, Schr. des Lukas, Sämmtl. Werke, 1836, ii. p. 214; *Stricker*, Jezus van Nazareth, 1868, ii. p. 265. Cf. *Ewald*, Die drei erst. Evv., p. 360; Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 581 f.; *De Wette*, Ev. Matth. p. 362.

[6] Cf. Joel ii. 10, 31, iii. 15; Amos viii. 9; Isaiah xiii. 10, l. 3, &c.

cried with a loud voice and yielded up his spirit, "the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom."[1] The third Synoptic associates this occurrence with the eclipse of the sun, and narrates it before the final cry and death of the Master.[2] The fourth Gospel takes no notice of so extraordinary a phenomenon. The question might be asked: How could the chief priests, who do not appear to have been at all convinced by such a miracle, but still continued their invincible animosity against the Christian sect, reveal the occurrence of such a wonder, of which there is no mention elsewhere? Here again the account is legendary and symbolical,[3] and in the spirit of the age of miracles.[4] The first Synoptist, however, has further marvels to relate. He states in continuation of the passage quoted above: "and the earth was shaken (ἐσείσθη) and the rocks were rent and the sepulchres were opened, and many bodies of the saints who slept were raised; and they came out of the sepulchres after his resurrection, and entered into the holy city and appeared unto many."[5] How great must be the amazement of anyone who may have been inclined to suppose the Gospels soberly historical works, on finding that the other three evangelists do not even mention these

[1] Mt. xxvii. 51; Mk. xv. 38. [2] Luke xxiii. 45.

[3] *Gfrörer*, Die heil Sage, i. p. 349, 352 f.; *Hase*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 279; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 437 ff.; *Krüger-Velthusen*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 252 f.; *Schleiermacher*, Schr. des Lukas, p. 213 f.; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 588; *Stricker*, Jezus v. Naz., ii. p. 265. Cf. *Ewald*, Die drei Evv., p. 360; Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 582; *Neander*, Leben Jesu, p. 574 f.

[4] We have elsewhere referred to the wonderful occurrences related by Josephus at the Temple about the time of the siege. Bell Jud., vi. 5 § 3. Cf. S. R., 6th ed., i. 121, 139. Cf. Apoc. xi. 19.

[5] καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐσείσθη, καὶ αἱ πέτραι ἐσχίσθησαν, καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα ἀνεῴχθησαν καὶ πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἠγέρθησαν· καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς. Matth. xxvii. 51-53.

astounding occurrences related by the first Synoptist! An earthquake (σεισμός)[1] and the still more astounding resurrection of many saints who appeared unto "many," and, therefore, an event by no means secret and unknown to all but the writer, and yet three other writers, who give accounts of the crucifixion and death of Jesus, and who enter throughout into very minute details, do not even condescend to mention them! Nor does any other New Testament writer chronicle them. It is scarcely necessary to say that the passage has been a very serious difficulty for apologists; and one of the latest writers of this school, reproducing the theories of earlier critics, deals with it in a Life of Christ, which "is avowedly and unconditionally the work of a believer,"[2] as follows: "An earthquake shook the earth and split the rocks, and as it rolled away from their places the great stones which closed and covered the cavern sepulchres of the Jews, so it seemed to the imaginations of many to have disimprisoned the spirits of the dead, and to have filled the air with ghostly visitants, who after Christ had risen appeared to linger in the Holy City." In a note he adds "Only in some such way as this can I account for the singular and wholly isolated allusion of Matt. xxvii. 52, 53."[3] It is worthy of note, and we may hereafter

[1] So the phenomenon is distinctly called in v. 54.

[2] *Farrar*, Life of Christ, i. Pref. p. viii.

[3] *Farrar*, Ib., ii. p. 419. Dean *Milman*, following the explanation of Michaelis, says: "Even the dreadful earthquake which followed, seemed to pass away without appalling the enemies of Jesus. The rending of the veil of the Temple from the top to the bottom, so strikingly significant of the approaching abolition of the local worship, would either be concealed by the priesthood, or attributed as a natural effect to the convulsion of the earth. The same convulsion would displace the stones which covered the ancient tombs and lay open many of the innumerable rock-hewn sepulchres which perforated the hills on every side of the city, and expose the dead to public view. To the awe struck and depressed

refer to the point, that learned divines thus do not scruple to adopt the "vision hypothesis" of the resurrection. Even if the resurrection of the saints so seriously related by the evangelist be thus disposed of, and it be assumed that the other Gospels, likewise adopting the "vision" explanation, consequently declined to give an objective place in their narrative to what they believed to be a purely subjective and unreal phenomenon, there still remains the earthquake, to which supernatural incident of the crucifixion none of the other evangelists think it worth while to refer. Need we argue that the earthquake [1] is as mythical as the resurrection of the saints? [2] In some apocryphal writings even the names of some of these risen saints are given.[3] As the case actually stands, with these marvellous incidents related solely by the first Synoptist and ignored by the other evangelists, it would seem superfluous to enter upon more detailed criticism of the passage; and to point out the incongruity of the

minds of the followers of Jesus, no doubt, were confined those visionary appearances of the spirits of their deceased brethren, which are obscurely intimated in the rapid narratives of the Evangelists." Hist. of Christianity, i. p. 336. It will be observed that inadvertently Dr. Milman has put "Evangelists" in the plural.

[1] *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 349; *Hase*, Leb. Jesu, p. 278 f; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 437 ff.; *Krüger-Velthusen*, Leb. Jesu, p. 252 f.; *Stricker*, Jezus v. Naz., ii. p. 265. Cf. *Ewald*, Die drei erst. Evv., p. 360; Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 581 f.; *Meyer*, Ev. Matth., p. 601 f.; *De Wette*, Ev. Matth., p. 362.

[2] *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 487 ff.; *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 419; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 352 f.; *Hase*, Leb. Jesu, p. 279; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 444 ff.; *Krüger-Velthusen*, Leb. Jesu, p. 252 f.; *Meijboom*, Het Geloof aan Jezus' Opstanding, 1865, p. 141 f.; *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 336 f.; *Schleiermacher*, Schr. d. Lukas, p. 214; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu, p. 589 f.; *Stricker*, Jezus v. Naz., ii. p. 265; *Volkmar*, Die Evangelien, p. 601; *De Wette*, Ev. Matth. p. 361 f.: *Wilcke*, Der Urevangelist, p. 639 f. Cf. *Ewald*, Die drei erst. Evv., p. 360; Gesch. V. Isr., v. p. 582 f.; *Krabbe*, Lehre d. Sünde, p. 297; *Meyer*, Ev. Mt. p. 601 f.

[3] Anaphora Pilati, *Thilo* Cod. Apoc. N. T., p. 810 f.; *Tischendorf*, Evang. Apocr., p. 424.

statement that these saints are said to be raised from the dead just as the Messiah expires, or the strange fact that, although the sepulchres are said to have been opened at that moment and the resurrection to have then taken place, it is stated that they only came out of their graves after the resurrection of Jesus. The allegation, moreover, that they were raised from the dead at that time, and before the resurrection of Jesus, virtually contradicts the saying of the Apocalypse (i. 5) that Jesus was the "first begotten of the dead," and of Paul (1 Cor. xv. 20) that he was "the first fruits of them who have fallen asleep.[1] Paul's whole argument is opposed to such a story; for he does not base the resurrection of the dead upon the death of Jesus, but, in contradistinction, upon his resurrection only. The Synoptist evidently desires to associate the resurrection of the saints with the death of Jesus to render that event more impressive, but delays the completion of it in order to give a kind of precedence to the resurrection of the Master. The attempt leads to nothing but confusion. What could be the object of such a resurrection? It could not be represented as any effect produced by the death of Jesus, nor even by his alleged resurrection, for what dogmatic connection could there be between that event and the fact that a few saints only were raised from their graves, whilst it was not pretended that the dead "saints" generally participated in this resurrection? No intimation is given that their appearance to many was for any special purpose, and certainly no practical result has ever been traced to it. Finally we might ask: What became of these saints raised from the dead? Did they die again? Or did they also "ascend into Heaven?"[2] A

[1] Can the author of the Apocalypse, or Paul, ever have heard of the raising of Lazarus?

[2] *Eichhorn*, Einl. N. T., i. p. 487 ff.

little reflection will show that these questions are pertinent. It is almost inconceivable that any serious mind could maintain the actual truth of such a story, upon such evidence. Its actual objective truth not being maintainable, however, the character of the work which advances such an unhesitating statement is determined, and at least the value of its testimony can without difficulty be settled.

The continuation of this episode in the first Synoptic is quite in keeping with its commencement. It is stated: "But when the centurion and they that were with him watching Jesus saw the earthquake (*σεισμὸν*) and the things that were done (*τὰ γενόμενα*) they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was a son of God" (*Ἀληθῶς υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν οὗτος*).[1] In Mark the statement is very curiously varied: "And when the centurion who stood over against him saw that he so expired, he said: Truly this man was a son of God."[2] It is argued on the one hand that the centurion's wonder here was caused by Jesus dying with so loud a cry, and the reading of many MSS. would clearly support this;[3] and on the other that the cause of his exclamation was the unexpectedly rapid death of Jesus. Whichever view be taken the centurion's deduction, it must be admitted, rests upon

[1] Mt. xxvii. 54. This is the reading of the Vatican Cod. and D, with some others. Cod. A, C, E, F, and many others read *θεοῦ υἱὸς*. The Sinaitic MS. has *Ἀλ. υἱὸς ἦν τοῦ θεοῦ οὗτος*. The rendering of the A. V., "the Son of God," cannot be sustained linguistically, whatever may have been the writer's intention.

[2] Mk. xv. 39. The A. V. has: "saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost:" *κράξας* has certainly high authority (A, C, E, G, H, &c., &c.; D has *κράξαντα*), but the Sin., Vat., and some other codices and versions, omit it, and it is rejected by Tischendorf. We, therefore, take the reading for the moment which leaves the question most open.

[3] *Meyer*, who takes the view, considers that, hearing Jesus expire with so loud a cry, the centurion concluded him to be a "Hero." Ev. des Mark. u. Lukas, 5te Aufl., 203 f.

singularly inconclusive reasoning. We venture to think that it is impossible that a Roman soldier could either have been led to form such an opinion upon such grounds, or to express it in such terms. In Luke, we have a third reading: "But when the centurion saw what what was done, he glorified God, saying: Certainly this man was righteous" [1] (Ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν). There is nothing here about the "Son of God;" but when the writer represents the Roman soldier as glorifying God, the narrative does not seem much more probable than that of the other Synoptists.

The fourth Evangelist of course does not refer to any such episode, but, as usual, he introduces a very remarkable incident of his own, of which the Synoptists, who record such peculiar details of what passed, seem very strangely to know nothing. The fourth evangelist states: "The Jews, therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies might not remain upon the cross on the sabbath, (for that sabbath-day was a high day), besought Pilate that their legs might be broken and they might be taken away. So the soldiers came and brake the legs of the first, and of the other who was crucified with him, but when they came to Jesus, as they saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs; but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith there came out blood and water. And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and that man knoweth that he saith what is true, that ye also may believe. For these things came to pass that the Scripture might be fulfilled: A bone of him shall not be broken. And again another Scripture saith: They shall look on him whom they pierced." [2] It is inconceivable that, if this

[1] xxiii. 47.

[2] John xix. 31—37.

actually occurred, and occurred more especially that the "Scripture might be fulfilled," the other three Evangelists could thus totally ignore it all.[1] The second Synoptist does more: he not only ignores but excludes it, for (xv. 43 f.) he represents Joseph as begging the body of Jesus from Pilate "when evening was now come." "And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead; and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he had been long dead. And when he knew it of the centurion he gave the corpse to Joseph."[2] Now, although there could be no doubt on the point, the fourth Gospel clearly states (xix. 38, *μετὰ ταῦτα*) that Joseph made his request for the body after the order had been given by Pilate to break the legs of the crucified, and after it had been executed as above described. If Pilate had already given the order to break the legs, how is it possible he could have marvelled, or acted as he is described in Mark to have done? It is well known that the Crurifragium, which is here applied, was not usually an accompaniment of crucifixion, though it may have been sometimes employed along with it,[3] but that it was a distinct punishment. It consisted in breaking, with hammers or clubs, the bones of the condemned from the hips to the feet. We shall not discuss whether in the present case this measure really was adopted or not. The representation is that the Jews requested Pilate to break the legs of the crucified that the bodies might be removed before the Sabbath, and

[1] The Sin., Vat., and other codices insert in Mt. xxvii. 49, the phrase from John xix. 34, *ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην, ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα*. Notwithstanding this high authority, it is almost universally acknowledged that the phrase is an interpolation here.

[2] Mk. xv. 44—45.

[3] Ebrard admits that it was not common. Evang. Gesch., p. 565, anm. 31.

that the order was given and executed. The first point to be noted is the very singular manner in which the leg-breaking was performed. The soldiers are said to have broken the legs of the first and then of the other who was crucified with Jesus, thus passing over Jesus in the first instance; and then the Evangelist says: "*but when they came to Jesus*, as they saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs, but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side." This order of procedure is singular; but the whole conduct of the guard is so extraordinary that such details become comparatively insignificant. An order having been given to the Roman soldiers, in accordance with the request of the Jews, to break the legs of the crucified, we are asked to believe that they did not execute it in the case of Jesus! It is not reasonable to suppose, however, that Roman soldiers either were in the habit of disregarding their orders, or could have any motive for doing so in this case, and subjecting themselves to the severe punishment for disobedience inflicted by Roman military law. It is argued that they saw that Jesus was already dead, and therefore that it was not necessary to break his legs; but soldiers are not in the habit of thinking in this way: they are disciplined to obey. The fact is, however, that the certainty that Jesus was dead already did not actually exist in their minds, and could scarcely have existed seeing that the death was so singularly rapid, for in that case why should the soldier have pierced his side with a spear? The only conceivable motive for doing so was to make sure that Jesus really was dead;[1] but is it possible to suppose that a Roman soldier, being in the slightest doubt, actually chose to assure himself in

[1] Cf. *Luthardt*, Das johann. Ev., 2te Aufl., 1876, ii. p. 483 f.

this way when he might still more effectually have done so by simply obeying the order of his superior and breaking the legs? The whole episode is manifestly unhistorical.[1] It is clear that, to fulfil in a marked way the prophecies which the writer had in his mind, and wished specially to apply to Jesus, it was necessary that, in the first place, there should have been a distinct danger of the bones being broken, and at the same time of the side not being pierced. The order to break the legs of the crucified is therefore given, but an extraordinary exception is made in favour of Jesus, and a thrust with the lance substituted, so that both passages of the Scripture are supposed to be fulfilled.[2] What Scriptures, however, are fulfilled? The first: "A bone of him shall not be broken," is merely the prescription with regard to the Paschal lamb, Ex. xii. 46,[3] and the dogmatic view of the fourth Evangelist leads him throughout to represent Jesus as the true Paschal lamb. The second is Zech. xii. 10,[4] and any one who reads the passage, even without the assistance of learned exegesis, may perceive that it has no such application as our Evangelist gives it. We shall pass over, as not absolutely necessary for our immediate purpose, very many important details of the episode; but regarding this part of the subject we may say that we consider it evident that, if an order was given to break the legs of the crucified upon this occasion, that order must have been executed upon Jesus equally with

[1] For the whole argument as to the leg-breaking and the lance-thrust, compare *Gfrörer*, Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit, p. 231 ff., 241 ff.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 508 ff.; *Scholten*, Ev. n. Johannes, p. 338 ff.; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu, p. 591 ff.; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., ii. p. 325 ff.

[2] *Strauss*, Das Leben Jesu, p. 593.

[3] Cf. Numbers ix. 12; Ps. xxxiv. 20.

[4] Cf. Ps. xxii. 16. We need not discuss here the variation in the quotation from Zech. xii. 10.

any others who may have been crucified with him. There has been much discussion as to the intention of the author in stating that, from the wound made by the lance, there forthwith came out "blood and water" (αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ); and likewise as to whether the special testimony here referred to in the third person is to attest more immediately the flow of blood and water, or the whole episode.[1] In regard to the latter point, we need not pause to discuss the question.[2] As to the "blood and water," some see in the statement made an intention to show the reality of the death of Jesus,[3] whilst others more rightly regard the phenomenon described as a representation of a supernatural and symbolical incident,[4] closely connected with the whole dogmatic view of the Gospel. It is impossible not to see in this the same idea as that expressed in 1 John v. 6: "This is he that came by water and blood, Jesus Christ; not in the water only, but in the water and the blood."[5] As a natural incident it cannot be entertained, for in no sense but mere quibbling could it be said that "blood and water" could flow from such a wound, and as a supernatural phenomenon it must be rejected. As a proof of the reality of

[1] Of course we do not here even touch upon the wider question raised by this passage.

[2] We refer readers to the works quoted in the following two notes.

[3] *Milman*, Hist. of Chr., i. p. 337; *Neander*, Leb. Jesu, p. 583, anm. 3; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, p. 443 f.; *De Wette*, Ev. Joh., p. 312. Cf. *Brückner*, zu de W. Ev. Joh., p. 312; *Ebrard*, zu Olsh. Leidensgesch., p. 187; *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 424.

[4] *Alford*, Gk. Test., i. p. 902; *Baur*, Unters. Kan. Evv., p. 216 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Das Heiligthum, p. 235 f.; *Hengstenberg*, Ev. Joh., iii. p. 278; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 442 f.; *Krüger-Velthusen*, Leb. Jesu, p. 254; *Luthardt*, Das joh. Ev., ii. p. 485 f.; *Meyer*, Ev. Joh., p. 636; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu, p. 594; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., i. p. 100 ff.; ii. p. 326 ff.; *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., Four Gospels, p. 357. Cf. *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 424; *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 316, anm. 3.

[5] Cf. John vii. 37—39, iii. 5, &c., &c.

the death of Jesus, it could only have been thought of at a time when gross ignorance prevailed upon all medical subjects. We shall not here discuss the reality of the death of Jesus, but we may merely point out that the almost unprecedentedly rapid decease of Jesus was explained by Origen[1] and some of the Fathers as miraculous. It has been argued that the thrust of the lance may have been intended to silence those objectors who might have denied the actual death on the ground that the legs of Jesus were not broken like those of the two malefactors,[2] and it certainly is generally quoted as having assured the fact of death. The statement that blood flowed from the wound, however, by no means supports the allegation and, although we may make little use of the argument, it is right to say that there is no evidence of any serious kind advanced of the reality of the death of Jesus, here or in the other Gospels.[3]

The author of the fourth Gospel himself seems to betray that this episode is a mere interpolation of his own into a narrative to which it does not properly belong.[4] According to his own account (xix. 31), the Jews besought Pilate that the legs might be broken and that the bodies "might be taken away" (ἀρθῶσιν). The order to do this was obviously given, for the legs are forthwith broken and of course,

[1] "Oravit Patrem, et exauditus est, et statim ut clamavit ad Patrem, receptus est aut sicut qui potestatem habebat ponendi animam suam, posuit eam quando voluit ipse . . . . Miraculum enim erat quoniam post tres horas receptus est," &c., &c. Orig. in Matth. ed. Delarue, 1740, iii. § 140, p. 928.

[2] The use of the verb νύσσω does not favour the view that the writer intended to express a deep wound.

[3] It has likewise been thought that the representation in Mark xv. 44, that Pilate marvelled at the rapid death of Jesus, and sent for the centurion to ascertain the fact, was made to meet similar doubts, or at least to give assurance of the reality of the death.

[4] *Strauss*, Das Leben Jesu, 1864, p. 596.

immediately after, the bodies in pursuance of the same order would have been taken away. As soon as the Evangelist has secured his purpose of showing how the Scriptures were fulfilled by means of this episode, he takes up the story as though it had not been interrupted, and proceeds v. 38: "After these things" (μετὰ ταῦτα), that is to say after the legs of the malefactors had been broken and the side of Jesus pierced, Joseph besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus, and Pilate gave leave. But, if v. 31f. be historical, the body must already have been taken away. All the Synoptics agree with the fourth Gospel in stating that Joseph of Arimathæa begged for and obtained the body of Jesus from Pilate.[1] The second and third Synoptics describe him as belonging to the Council, but the first Gospel merely calls him "a rich man," whilst the fourth omits both of these descriptions. They all call him a disciple of Jesus—secretly for fear of the Jews, the fourth Gospel characteristically adds—although the term that he was "waiting for the Kingdom of God," used by the second and third Gospels, is somewhat vague. The fourth Gospel, however, introduces a second personage in the shape of Nicodemus, "who at the first came to him by night,"[2] and who, it will be remembered, had previously been described as "a ruler of the Jews."[3] The Synoptics do not once mention such a person, either in the narrative of the Passion or in the earlier chapters, and there are more than doubts as to his historical character.[4]

The accounts of the Entombment given by the three

[1] According to Luke xxiii. 53, Joseph actually "took down" the body.
[2] John iii. 1. [3] John iii. 1, vii. 50.
[4] Cf. *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 517 ff.

Synoptists, or at least by the second and third, distinctly exclude the narrative of the fourth Gospel, both as regards Nicodemus and the part he is represented as taking. The contradictions which commence here between the account of the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, in fact, are of the most glaring and important nature, and demand marked attention. The fourth Gospel states that, having obtained permission from Pilate, Joseph came and took the body of Jesus away. "And there came also Nicodemus, ... bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pound weight. They took, therefore, the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen cloths with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre wherein was never man yet laid. There, therefore, on account of the preparation of the Jews (*ἐκεῖ οὖν διὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων*), they laid Jesus, for the sepulchre was at hand" (*ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον*).[1] According to the first Synoptic, when Joseph took the body, he simply wrapped it "in clean linen" (*ἐν σινδόνι καθαρᾷ*) and "laid it in his own new sepulchre, which he hewed in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed."[2] There is no mention of spices or any anointing of the body,[3] and the statement that the women provide for this is not made in this Gospel. According to the writer, the burial is complete, and the sepulchre finally closed. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary come merely "to behold the sepulchre" at the end of the

[1] John xix. 39—42. [2] Mt. xxvii. 59 ff.

[3] *Strauss* suggests that, for the first Synoptist, his anointing had already been accomplished. Cf. xxvi. 12; Das Leben Jesu, p. 598.

Sabbath.[1] The fourth Evangelist apparently does not know anything of the sepulchre being Joseph's own tomb, and the body is, according to him, although fully embalmed, only laid in the sepulchre in the garden on account of the Sabbath and because it was at hand. We shall refer to this point, which must be noted, further on. There are very striking differences between these two accounts, but the narratives of the second and third Synoptists are still more emphatically contradictory of both. In Mark,[2] we are told that Joseph "bought linen, and took him down and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a sepulchre which had been hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone against the door of the sepulchre." There is no mention here of any embalming performed by Joseph or Nicodemus, nor are any particulars given as to the ownership of the sepulchre, or the reasons for its selection. We are, however, told:[3] "And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought spices that they might come and anoint him." It is distinctly stated in connection with the entombment, moreover, in agreement with the first Synoptic:[4] "And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid."[5] According to this account and that of the first Gospel, the women, having remained to the last and seen the body deposited in the sepulchre, knew so little of its having been embalmed by Joseph and Nicodemus, that they actually purchase the spices and come to perform that office themselves. In Luke, the statement is still more specific, in agree-

[1] Mt. xxviii. 1. [2] Mk. xv. 46. [3] Mk. xvi. 1.
[4] Mt. xxvii. 61. [5] Mk. xv. 47.

ment with Mark, and in contradiction to the fourth Gospel. Joseph took down the body "and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid. . . . . And women who had come with him out of Galilee followed after, and beheld the sepulchre *and how his body was laid.* And they returned and prepared spices and ointments." Upon the first day of the week, the author adds: "they came unto the sepulchre bringing the spices which they had prepared."[1] Which of these accounts are we to believe? According to the first Gospel, there is no embalmment at all; according to the second and third Gospels, the embalmment is undertaken by the women, and not by Joseph and Nicodemus, but is never carried out; according to the fourth Gospel, the embalmment is completed on Friday evening by Joseph and Nicodemus, and not by the women. According to the first Gospel, the burial is completed on Friday evening; according to the second and third, it is only provisional; and according to the fourth, the embalmment is final, but it is doubtful whether the entombment is final or temporary; several critics consider it to have been only provisional.[2] In Mark, the women buy the spices "when the Sabbath was past" (*διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου*);[3] in Luke before it has begun;[4] and in Matthew and John they do not buy them at all. In the first and fourth Gospels, the women come after the Sabbath merely to behold the sepulchre,[5] and in the second and third, they bring the spices to complete the burial.

[1] Luke xxiii. 53 ff., xxiv. 1. [2] *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, p. 447.
[3] Mk. xvi. 1. [4] Luke xxiii. 35.
[5] Mt. xxviii. 1; John xx. 1.

Amid these conflicting statements we may suggest one consideration. It is scarcely probable, in a hot climate, that a wounded body, hastily laid in a sepulchre on Friday evening before six o'clock, would be disturbed again on Sunday morning for the purpose of being anointed and embalmed. Corruption would, under the circumstances, already have commenced. Besides, as Keim[1] has pointed out, the last duties to the dead were not forbidden amongst the Jews on the Sabbath, and there is really no reason why any care for the body of the Master which reverence or affection might have dictated should not at once have been bestowed.

The enormous amount of myrrh and aloes—"about a hundred pound weight" (ὡς λίτρας ἑκατόν)—brought by Nicodemus has excited much discussion, and adds to the extreme improbability of the story related by the fourth Evangelist.[2] To whatever weight the litra may be reduced, the quantity specified is very great; and it is a question whether the body thus enveloped "as the manner of the Jews is to bury" could have entered the sepulchre. The practice of embalming the dead, although well known amongst the Jews, and invariable in the case of Kings and noble or very wealthy persons, was by no means generally prevalent. In the burial of Gamaliel the elder, chief of the party of the Pharisees, it is stated that over 80 pounds of balsam were burnt in his honour by the proselyte Onkelos;[3] but this quantity, which was considered very

[1] Schabbath 151.1; *Keim*, Jesu von Nazara, iii. 522, anm. 1.

[2] *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 521 f.; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., ii. p. 342 f. Cf. *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 429, note 1; *Luthardt*, Das joh. Ev., ii. p. 492; *Olshausen*, Leidensgesch., p. 189.

[3] *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, iii. 521.

remarkable, is totally eclipsed by the provision of Nicodemus.

The key to the whole of this history of the burial of Jesus, however, is to be found in the celebrated chapt. liii. of "Isaiah." We have already, in passing, pointed out that, in the third Gospel (xxii. 37), Jesus is represented as saying: "For I say unto you, that this which is written must be accomplished in me: And he was reckoned among transgressors." The same quotation from Is. liii. 12 is likewise interpolated in Mk. xv. 28. Now the whole representation of the burial and embalmment of Jesus is evidently based upon the same chapter, and more especially upon v. 9, which is wrongly rendered both in the authorized version and in the Septuagint, in the latter of which the passage reads: "I will give the wicked for his grave and the rich for his death."[1] The Evangelists taking this to be the sense of the passage, which they suppose to be a Messianic prophecy, have represented the death of Jesus as being with the wicked, crucified as he is between two robbers; and through Joseph of Arimathæa, significantly called "a rich man" (*ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος*) by the first Synoptist, especially according to the fourth Evangelist by his addition of the counsellor Nicodemus and his hundred pounds weight of mingled myrrh and aloes, as being "with the rich in his death." Unfortunately, the passage in the "prophecy" does not mean what the Evangelists have been led to understand, and the ablest Hebrew scholars and critics are now agreed that both phrases quoted refer, in true Hebrew manner, to one representation, and that the word above trans-

[1] *Καὶ δώσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ.* Is. liii. 9.

lated "rich" is not used in a favourable sense, but that the passage must be rendered: "And they made his grave with the wicked and his sepulchre with the evil-doers," or words to that effect.[1] Without going minutely into the details of opinion on the subject of the "servant of Jehovah" in this writing of the Old Testament, we may add that upon one point at least the great majority of critics are of one accord: that Is. liii. and other passages of "Isaiah" describing the sufferings of the "Servant of Jehovah" have no reference to the Messiah.[2] As we have

[1] *Anger*, Vorles. Gesch. d. Mess. Idee, herausg. Krenkel, 1873, p. 65; *Beck*, Die cyrojesajan. Weissag., 1844, p, 138 ff.; *Bunsen*, Bibelw., 1860, ii. p. 440 f.; Gott. in d. Gesch., 1857, i. p. 251; *Cheyne*, The Book of Isaiah chron. arranged, 1870, p. 190; *Mallet de Chilly*, Les Prophètes, 1862, p. 317; *Davidson*, Int. O. T., iii. p. 62; *Ewald*, Die Propheten d. Alt. B. 2te Aufl., iii. p. 92; *Gesenius*, Der Prophet Jesaia, 2te Aufl., i. 1829, p. 129; iii. 1821, p. 163, 167 f., 184 f.; *Hendewerk*, Des Prophet. Jesaja Weissag., 1843, ii. p. 132; *Hitzig*, Der Proph. Jesaia, 1833, p. 572 ff.; Die prophet. Büch. des A. T. übers., 1854, p. 80; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 527, anm. 1; *Knobel*, Der Proph. Jesaja, 1861, p. 389 f.; *Meijboom*, Jezus' Opstanding, p. 150: *Reuss*, La Bible: Les Prophètes, ii. p. 1875, p. 278; *Schegg*, Der Proph. Jesajas, i. p. 152 f.; *Sam. Sharpe*, The Heb. Scriptures, 1866, iii. p. 140; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu, p. 597; *Volkmar*, Die Rel. Jesu, p. 78; Die Evangelien, p. 603 f.; *De Wette*, Die heil. Schr. des A. u. N. T. 4te Aufl., p. 738; *Rowland Williams*, The Hebrew Prophets, ii. 1871, p. 440 f. Cf. *Birks*, Comm. on Book of Isaiah, 1871, p. 271; *Rosenmüller*, Scholia in V. T. Jesajae, iii. p. 360 ff.; *Seinecke*, Der Ev. d. A. T., 1870, p. 206 f.

[2] *Anger*, Vorles. üb. Gesch. d. Mess. Idee, 1873, p. 64 ff.; *Beck*, De cap. quinquagesimo tertio Lib. Jesajani, 1840, p. 80 ff.; Die cyrojes. Weissag., p. 23 ff. 128 ff., 138 ff.; *Bunsen*, Bibelw., ii., 1860, p. 439 f.; cf. Gott in d. Gesch., i. p. 249 ff.; *Cheyne*, Isaiah chron. arranged, 1870, p. 190 ff.; *Colani*, Jésus-Christ et les Croyances Mess., 1864, p. 132 f.; *Davidson*, Int. O. T., iii. p. 62 ff.; *Ewald*, Die Propheten des A. B., iii. p. 89 ff.; *Gesenius*, Der Prophet Jesaia, iii., 1821, p. 160 ff.; *Hendewerk*, Des Proph. Jesaja Weissag., ii. p. 122 ff.; *Hitzig*, Der Prophet Jesaia, 1833, p. 564 ff.; *Kleinart*, Stud. u. Krit., 1862, p. 699 ff.; *Knobel*, Der Proph. Jesaia, 1861, p. 389 ff.; *Kuenen*, De Profeten en de Prof. ond. Israël, 1875, i. p. 257 ff., ii. p. 287 ff.; *Meijboom*, Jezus' Opstanding, p. 153 f.; *G. R. Noyes*, New Trans. of Hebrew Prophets, 1866, Intr., p. xl. ff.; *Reuss*, La Bible: Les Prophètes, 1876, ii. p. 279 f.; *Rosenmüller*,

touched upon this subject it may not be out of place to add that Psalms xxii.[1] and lxix.,[2] which are so frequently quoted in connection with the passion, and represented by New Testament and other early writers as Messianic, are determined by sounder principles of criticism applied to them in modern times not to refer to the Messiah at all. We have elsewhere spoken of other supposed Messianic Psalms quoted in the New Testament.[3]

We now come to a remarkable episode which is peculiar to the first Synoptic and strangely ignored by all the other Gospels. It is stated that the next day—that is to say, on the Sabbath—the chief priests and the Pharisees came together to Pilate, saying: "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive: After three

Scholia in Jesaiæ vaticinia, 1820, iii. p. 323 ff.; *Schenkel*, Stud. u. Krit., 1836, p. 982 ff.; *Seinecke*, Der Evang. d. A. T., p. 21 ff., 206 f.; *Stähelin*, Die mess. Weissagungen, 1847, p. 101 ff.; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu, p. 231 ff., 575 f; *De Wette*, Comm. de morte J. C. expiatoria, p. 13 ff., 26 ff.; Einl. A. T., p. 281; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., i. p. 425 ff. Cf. *Riehm*, Stud. u. Krit., 1865, p. 457 f., 487 ff.; 1869, p. 258 ff.

[1] *R. Anger*, Vorles. üb. Gesch. Mess. Idee, 1873, p. 73 f.; *Bleek*, Einl. A. T. 2te Aufl., p. 624 f.; *Davidson*, Int. O. T., 1862, ii. p. 280 f.; *Kamphausen*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., 1868, iii. p. 41 f.; *Kuenen*, De Profeten, ii. p. 242, 248 ff.; *Reuss*, La Bible: Le Psautier, 1875, p. 117 ff; *Rosenmüller*, Scholia in Vet. Test., Psalmi, ii. p. 576 ff.; *Ruperti*, in Pott's Sylloge Comm. Theol., 1801. ii. p. 280; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 578; *De Wette*, Die Psalmen, p. 234; Ev. Johannes, p. 306. Cf. *Hengstenberg*, Die Psalmen, 2te Aufl. ii. p. 7 ff.; *Lücke*, Ev. Johan., 1843, ii. p. 760 f.

[2] *R. Anger*, Vorles. Gesh. Mess. Idee, p. 74; *G. Baur*, Gesch. A. T. Weissag., p. 416; *Bleek*, Einl. A. T., p. 625; *Davidson*, Int. O. T., ii. p. 302; *Ewald*, Die Psalmen, 3te Aufl., 1866, p. 292 f.; *Four Friends*, The Psalms chron. arranged, p. 227; *Hitzig*, Die Psalmen, ii. 1 p. 93 ff.; *Hupfeld*, Die Psalmen, ed. Riehm., 1870, iii. p. 259; *Kamphausen*, in Bunsen's Bibelw., iii. p. 138; *Kuenen*, De Profeten, ii. p. 243 ff., 248 ff., 252 ff.; *Lücke*, Ev. Joh., ii. p. 764; *J. Olshausen*, Die Psalmen, p. 298; *Reuss*, La Bible: Le Psautier, p. 240 ff.; *Rosenmüller*, Scholia in Vet. Test., 1823, iii. p. 1295 f.; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 578; Cf. *Hengstenberg*, Die Psalmen, iii. p. 240 ff.

[3] See p. 82 ff., 106 f.

days I am raised (Μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγείρομαι). Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come and steal him away and say unto the people: He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them: Ye have a guard (Ἔχετε κουστωδίαν): go, make it as sure as ye can. So they went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, with the guard." [1] Not only do the other Evangelists pass over this strange proceeding in total silence, but their narratives exclude it, at least those of the second and third Synoptists do so. The women came with their spices to embalm the body, in total ignorance of there being any guard to interfere with their performance of that last sad office for the Master. We are asked to believe that the chief priests and the Pharisees actually desecrated the Sabbath and visited the house of the heathen Pilate on so holy a day, for the purpose of asking for the guard.[2] These priests are said to have remembered and understood a prophecy of Jesus regarding his resurrection, of which his disciples are represented to be in ignorance.[3] The remark about "the last error," moreover, is very suspicious. The ready acquiescence of Pilate is quite incredible.[4] That he should employ Roman soldiers to watch the sepulchre of a man who had been crucified cannot be entertained; and his friendly: "Go, make it as sure as ye can," is not in the spirit of Pilate. It is conceivable that

[1] Mt. xxvii 62—66.

[2] *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, iii. p. 524. [3] Cf. John xx. 9.

[4] It has been argued that Pilate does not give a Roman guard, but merely permits the chief priests to make use of their own guard. This, however, is opposed to the whole tenor of the story, and the suggestion is generally rejected. Tertullian says: "Tunc Judæi detractum et sepulchro conditum magna etiam militaris custodiæ diligentia circumsederunt." Apol. § 21.

to satisfy their clamour he may, without much difficulty, have consented to crucify a Jew, more especially as his crime was of a political character represented as in some degree affecting the Roman power; but, once crucified, it is not in the slightest degree likely that Pilate would care what became of his body, and still less that he would employ Roman soldiers to mount guard over it. It may be as well to dispose finally of this episode, so we at once proceed to its conclusion. When the resurrection takes place, it is stated that some of the guard went into the city, and, instead of making their report to Pilate, as might have been expected, told the chief priests all that had occurred. A council is held, and the soldiers are largely bribed, and instructed: "Say that his disciples came by night and stole him while we slept. And if this come to the governor's ears we will persuade him and make you free from care. So they took the money and did as they were taught." [1] Nothing could be more simple than the construction of the story, which follows the usual broad lines of legend. The idea of Roman soldiers confessing that they slept whilst on watch, and allowed that to occur which they were there to prevent! and this to oblige the chief priests and elders, at the risk of their lives! Then are we to suppose that the chief priest and council believed this story of the earthquake and angel, and yet acted in this way? and if they did not believe it, would not the very story itself have led to the punishment of the men, and to the confirmation of the report they desired to spread, that the disciples had stolen the body? The large bribe seems to have been very ineffectual, however, since the Christian historian is able to report precisely what the

[1] Mt. xxviii. 11—15.

chief priests and elders instruct them to say.[1] Is it not palpable that the whole story is legendary?[2] If it be so, and we think it cannot be doubted, a conclusion which the total silence of the other Gospels seems to confirm, very suggestive consequences may be deduced from it. The first Synoptist, referring to the false report which the Sanhedrin instruct the soldiers to make, says: "And this saying was spread among the Jews unto this day."[3] The probable origin of the legend, therefore, may have been an objection to the Christian affirmation of the resurrection to the above effect; but it is instructive to find that Christian tradition was equal to the occasion, and invented a story to refute it. It is the tendency to this very system of defence and confirmation, everywhere apparent, which renders early Christian tradition so mythical and untrustworthy.

We now enter upon the narrative of the Resurrection itself. The first Synoptist relates that Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to behold the sepulchre "at the close of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn into the first day of the week" (Ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων),[4] that is to say, shortly after six o'clock on the evening of Saturday, the end of the Sabbath, the dawn of the next day being marked by the

[1] Olshausen, to obviate the difficulty of supposing that the Sanhedrin did all this, supposes that Caiaphas the high priest may have been the principal agent. Bibl. Comm., ii. 2, p. 190 f.

[2] *Eichhorn*, Einl., i. p. 490 f.; *Ewald*, Die drei erst. Evv., p. 365; *Ufrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 354 f.; *Kern*, Tüb. Zeitschr., 1834, ii. p. 100 f.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 523 ff., 556 ff.; *Meijboom*, Jezus' Opstanding, p. 139 ff.; *Meyer*, Ev. Matth., p. 607 f.; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, p. 445, n. 1; *Scholten*, Het Ev. n. Joh., p. 358 f.; *Strauss*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 599 f.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 523; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., ii. p. 343 f.; *Wilcke*, Der Urevangelist, 1838, p. 640 f. Cf. *De Wette*, Ev. Matth., p. 370 f.

[3] Mt. xxviii. 15.

[4] Mt. xxviii. 1.

glimmer of more than one star in the heavens.[1] The second Synoptic represents that, "when the Sabbath was past," Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome bought spices, and that they came to the sepulchre "very early on the first day of the week after the rising of the sun" (*καὶ λίαν πρωὶ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων . . . ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου*).[2] The third Synoptist states that the women who came with Jesus from Galilee came to the sepulchre, but he subsequently more definitely names them: "Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the other women with them,"[3] —a larger number of women,—and they came "upon the first day of the week at early dawn" (*Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ὄρθρου βαθέως*). The fourth Evangelist represents that Mary Magdalene only[4] came to the sepulchre, on the first day of the week, "early, while it was yet dark" (*πρωὶ σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης*).[5]

The first Evangelist indubitably makes the hour at which the women come to the sepulchre different and much earlier than the others, and at the same time he represents them as witnessing the actual removal of the stone, which, in the other three Gospels, the women already find rolled away from the mouth of the sepulchre.[6] It will, therefore, be interesting to follow the first Synoptic. It is here stated: 2. "And behold there was a great earthquake (*σεισμὸς*): for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven and came and rolled away the stone and sat upon it. 3. His appearance was like lightning, and his raiment white as

[1] *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, iii. 552 f.

[2] Mk. xvi. 2. [3] Luke xxiii. 55, xxiv. 1, 10.

[4] It is argued from the *οἴδαμεν* of xx. 2, that there were others with her although they are not named. [5] John xx. 1.

[6] Mk. xvi. 4; Luke xxiv. 2; John xx. 1.

snow. 4. And for fear of him the keepers did shake and became as dead men. 5. And the angel answered and said unto the women: Fear ye not, for I know that ye seek Jesus, who hath been crucified. 6. He is not here: for he was raised (*ἠγέρθη γάρ*) as he said: Come, see the place where he lay. 7. And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he was raised (*ἠγέρθη*) from the dead, and behold he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him: behold, I have told you. 8. And they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and ran to tell his disciples." [1] We have here in the first place another earthquake and apparently, on the theory of the course of cosmical phenomena held during the "Age of Miracles," produced by the angel who descended to roll away the stone from the sepulchre. This earthquake, like the others recorded in the first Synoptic, appears to be quite unknown to the other Evangelists, and no trace of it has been pointed out in other writings. With the appearance of the angel we obviously arrive upon thoroughly unhistorical ground. Can we believe, because this unknown writer tells us so, that "an angel," [2] causing an earthquake, actually descended and took such a part in this transaction? Upon the very commonest

[1] Mt. xxviii. 2. *καὶ ἰδοὺ σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας· ἄγγελος γὰρ κυρίου καταβὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ προσελθὼν ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον καὶ ἐκάθητο ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ. 3. ἦν δὲ ἡ εἰδέα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀστραπή, καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν ὡσεὶ χιών. 4. ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ φόβου αὐτοῦ ἐσείσθησαν οἱ τηροῦντες καὶ ἐγενήθησαν ὡς νεκροί. 5. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν ταῖς γυναιξίν· Μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς· οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ζητεῖτε. 6. οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε· ἠγέρθη γάρ, καθὼς εἶπεν· δεῦτε ἴδετε τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἔκειτο. 7. καὶ ταχὺ πορευθεῖσαι εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε. ἰδοὺ εἶπον ὑμῖν. 8. καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς μεγάλης ἔδραμον ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.*

[2] Compare his description with Dan. x. 6. It is worthy of consideration also that when Daniel is cast into the den of lions a stone is rolled upon the mouth of the den, and sealed with the signet of the king and his lords, vi. 17.

principles of evidence, the reply must be an emphatic negative. Every fact of science, every lesson of experience excludes such an assumption, and we may add that the character of the author, with which we are now better acquainted, as well as the course of the narrative itself, confirms the justice of such a conclusion.[1] If the introduction of the angel be legendary, must not also his words be so? Proceeding, however, to examine the narrative as it stands, we must point out a circumstance which, it seems to us, may appropriately be mentioned here, and which is well worthy of attention. The women and the guard are present when the stone is rolled away from the sepulchre, but they do not witness the actual Resurrection. It is natural to suppose that, when the stone was removed, Jesus, who, it is asserted, rises with his body from the dead, would have come forth from the sepulchre: but not so; the angel only says, v. 6: "He is not here: for he was raised (ἠγέρθη γάρ);" and he merely invites the women to see the place where he lay. The actual resurrection is spoken of as a thing which had taken place before, and in any case it was not witnessed by any one. In the other Gospels, the resurrection has already occurred before any one arrives at the sepulchre; and the remarkable fact is, therefore, absolutely undeniable, that there was not, and that it is not even pretended that there was, a single eye-witness of the actual Resurrection. The empty grave, coupled with the supposed subsequent appearances of Jesus, is the only evidence of the Resurrection. We shall not, however, pursue this further at present. The removal of the stone is not followed by any visible result. The inmate of the sepulchre is not

[1] *Hase*, Das Leb. Jesu, p. 279; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 547 f.; *Lücke*, Das Ev. Joh., ii. p. 780 f.

observed to issue from it, and yet he is not there. May we not ask what was the use, in this narrative, of the removal of the stone at all? As no one apparently came forth, the only purpose seems to have been to permit those from without to enter and see that the sepulchre was empty. Another remarkable point is that the angel desires the women to go quickly and inform the disciples: "he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him." One is tempted to inquire why, as he rose from the dead in Jerusalem and, in spite of previous statements, the disciples are represented as being there also,[1] Jesus did not appear to them in the Holy City, instead of sending them some three days' journey off to Galilee. At the same time, Jesus is represented by the first two Synoptics as saying at the last Supper, when warning the disciples that they will all be offended at him that night and be scattered: "But after I shall have been raised, I will go before you into Galilee."[2] At present we have only to call attention to the fact that the angel gives the order. With how much surprise, therefore, do we not immediately after read that, as the women departed quickly to tell the disciples in obedience to the angel's message, v. 9: "Behold Jesus met them, saying, Hail. And they came up to him and laid hold of his feet, and worshipped him. 10. Then saith Jesus unto them: Be not afraid: go, tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there they shall see me."[3] What was the use of the angel's message since Jesus himself immediately after appears and delivers the very same instructions in person? This sudden and apparently unnecessary appearance has all the character of an afterthought. One point, how-

[1] Luke xxiv. 33; John xx. 18 ff. [2] Mt. xxvi. 32; Mk. xiv. 28.
[3] Mt. xxviii. 9, 10.

ever, is very clear : that the order to go into Galilee and the statement that there first Jesus is to appear to the disciples are unmistakable, repeated and peremptory.

We must now turn to the second Gospel. The women going to the sepulchre with spices that they might anoint the body of Jesus—which, according to the fourth Gospel, had already been fully embalmed and, in any case, had been already since the Friday evening in the sepulchre—are represented as saying amongst themselves: "Who will roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?"[1] This is a curious dramatic speculation, but very suspicious. These women are apparently not sufficiently acquainted with Joseph of Arimathæa to be aware that, as the fourth Gospel asserts, the body had already been embalmed, and yet they actually contemplate rolling the stone away from the mouth of a sepulchre which was his property.[2] Keim has pointed out that it was a general rule[3] that after a sepulchre had been closed in the way described it should not again be opened. Generally, the stone was not placed against the opening of the sepulchre till the third day, when corruption had already commenced; but here the sepulchre is stated by all the Gospels to have been closed on the first day, and the unhesitating intention of the women to remove the stone is not a happy touch on the part of the second Synoptist. They find the stone already rolled away.[4] Ver. 5: "And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were

[1] Mk. xvi. 3.

[2] *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, iii. p. 522. [3] Ib., iii. 522, anm. 1.

[4] Mk. xvi. 4. The continuation: "for it was very great" (ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα), is peculiar, but of course intended to represent the difficulty of its removal.

affrighted. 6. And he saith unto them: Be not affrighted: Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, the crucified: he was raised (*ἠγέρθη*); he is not here; behold the place where they laid him. 7. But go, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him, as he said unto you. 8. And they went out and fled from the sepulchre: for trembling and astonishment seized them, and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid."[1] In Matthew, the angel rolls away the stone from the sepulchre and sits upon it, and the women only enter to see where Jesus lay, upon his invitation. Here, they go in at once, and see the angel ("a young man") sitting at the right side, and are affrighted. He re-assures them and, as in the other narrative, says: "he was raised." He gives them the same message to his disciples and to Peter, who is specially named, and the second Synoptic thus fully confirms the first in representing Galilee as the place where Jesus is to be seen by them. It is curious that the women should say nothing to anyone about this wonderful event, and in this the statements of the other Gospels are certainly not borne out. There is one remarkable point to be noticed, however, that, according to the second Synoptist also, not only is there no eye-witness of the Resurrection, but the only evidence of that marvellous occurrence which it contains is the information of the "young man," which is clearly no evidence at all. There is no appearance of Jesus to any one narrated, and it would seem as though the appearance described in

[1] Mk. xvi. 5: *καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς, περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκήν, καὶ ἐξεθαμβήθησαν.* 6. *ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς· Μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε· Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον· ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε· ἴδε ὁ τόπος ὅπου ἔθηκαν αὐτόν.* 7. *ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ ὅτι προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε, καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν.* 8. *καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου· εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον· ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.*

Matt. xxviii. 9f. is excluded. It is well known that Mark xvi. 9-20 did not form part of the original Gospel and is inauthentic. It is unnecessary to argue a point so generally admitted. The verses now appended to the Gospel are by a different author and are of no value as evidence. We, therefore, exclude them from consideration.

In Luke, as in the second Synoptic, the women find the stone removed, and here it is distinctly stated that "on entering in they found not the body of the Lord Jesus. 4. And it came to pass as they were perplexed thereabout, behold two men stood by them in shining garments; 5. And as they were afraid, and bowed their faces to the earth, they said unto them: Why seek ye the living among the dead? 6. He is not here, but was raised (ἠγέρθη); remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, 7. saying, that the Son of Man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified and the third day rise again. 8. And they remembered his words, 9. and returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven and to all the rest. . . . 11. And these words appeared to them as an idle tale, and they believed them not."[1] The author of the third Gospel is not content with one angel, like the first two Synoptists, but introduces "two men in shining garments," who seem suddenly to stand beside the women, and instead of re-assuring them, as in the former narratives, rather adopt a tone of reproof (v. 5). They inform the women that "Jesus was raised;" and here again not only has no one been an eye-witness of the resurrection, but the women only hear of it from the angels. There is one striking peculiarity in the above

[1] Luke xxiv. 3—9, 11. It is unnecessary to say that v. 12 is a later interpolation.

account. There is no mention whatever of Jesus going before his disciples into Galilee to be seen of them, nor indeed of his being seen at all; but "Galilee" is introduced by way of a reminiscence. Instead of the future, the third Synoptist substitutes the past and, as might be expected, he gives no hint of any appearances of Jesus to the disciples beyond the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. When the women tell the disciples what they have seen and heard, they do not believe them. The thief on the cross, according to the writer, was more advanced in his faith and knowledge than the Apostles. Setting aside Mat. xxviii. 9, 10, we have hitherto no other affirmation of the Resurrection than the statement that the sepulchre was found empty, and the angels announced that Jesus was raised from the dead.

The account of the fourth Evangelist, however, differs completely from the narratives of all the Synoptists. According to him Mary Magdalene alone comes to the sepulchre and sees the stone taken away. She therefore runs and comes to Simon Peter and to "the other disciple whom Jesus loved," saying: "They took (ἦραν) the Lord out of the sepulchre and we know not (οὐκ οἴδαμεν)[1] where they laid (ἔθηκαν) him. 3. Peter, therefore, went forth and the other disciple, and came to the sepulchre. 4. And the two ran together; and the other disciple outran Peter and came first to the sepulchre; 5. and stooping down, looking in, he seeth the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in. 6. Then cometh Simon Peter following him and went into the

[1] From the use of this plural, as we have already pointed out, it is argued that there were others with Mary who are not named. This by no means follows, but if it were the case the peculiarity of the narrative becomes all the more apparent.

sepulchre and beholdeth the linen clothes lying, 7. and the napkin that was on his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped in one place by itself. 8. Then went in, therefore, the other disciple also, who came first to the sepulchre and he saw and believed. 9. For as yet they knew not the scriptures, that he must rise again from the dead. 10. So the disciples went away to their own homes."[1] Critics have long ago pointed out the careful way in which the actions of "the beloved disciple" and Peter are balanced in this narrative. If the "other disciple" outstrips Peter, and first looks into the sepulchre, Peter first actually enters; and if Peter first sees the careful arrangement of the linen clothes, the other sees and believes. The evident care with which the writer metes out a share to each disciple in this visit to the sepulchre, of which the Synoptics seem totally ignorant, is very suggestive of artistic arangement, and the careful details regarding the folding and position of the linen clothes, which has furnished so much matter for apologetic reasoning, seems to us to savour more of studied composition than natural observation. So very much is passed over in complete silence which is of the very highest importance, that minute details like these, which might well be composed in the study, do not produce so much effect as some critics think they should do. There is some ambiguity as to what the disciple "believed," according to v. 8, when he went into the sepulchre; and some understand that he simply believed what Mary Magdalene had told them (v. 2), whilst others hold that he believed in the resurrection, which, taken in connection with the following verse, seems undoubtedly to be the author's meaning. If the former were the reading it would be too trifling a point to be so promi-

[1] John xx. 2—10.

nently mentioned, and it would not accord with the contented return home of the disciples. Accepting the latter sense, it is instructive to observe the very small amount of evidence with which "the beloved disciple" is content. He simply finds the sepulchre empty and the linen clothes lying, and although no one even speaks of the resurrection, no one professes to have been an eye-witness of it, and "as yet they know not the scriptures, that he must rise again from the dead," he is nevertheless said to see and believe.

It will have been observed that as yet, although the two disciples have both entered the sepulchre, there has been no mention whatever of angels: they certainly did not see any. In immediate continuation of the narrative, however, we learn that when they have gone home, Mary Magdalene, who was standing without at the tomb weeping, stooped down and, looking into the sepulchre,—where just before the disciples had seen no one,—she beheld "two angels in white sitting, one at the head and one at the feet, where the body of Jesus lay. 13. They say unto her: Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them: Because they took away (ἦραν) my Lord, and I know not where they laid him."[1] This again is a very different representation and conversation from that reported in the other Gospels. Do we acquire any additional assurance as to the reality of the angels and the historical truth of their intervention from this narrative? We think not. Mary Magdalene repeats to the angels almost the very words she had said to the disciples, v. 2. Are we to suppose that "the beloved disciple," who saw and believed, did not communicate his conviction to the others, and that Mary was left pre-

[1] John xx. 12, 13.

cisely in the same doubt and perplexity as before, without an idea that anything had happened except that the body had been taken away and she knew not where it had been laid? She appears to have seen and spoken to the angels with singular composure. Their sudden appearance does not even seem to have surprised her. We must, however, continue the narrative, and it is well to remark the artificial maintenance, at first, of the tone of affected ignorance, as well as the dramatic construction of the whole scene: v. 14. "Having said this, she turned herself back and beholdeth Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. 15. Jesus saith unto her: Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing that it was the gardener, saith unto him: Sir, if thou didst bear him hence, tell me where thou didst lay him, and I will take him away. 16. Jesus saith unto her: Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him in Hebrew:[1] Rabboni, which is to say, Master. 17. Jesus saith unto her: Touch me not (Μή μου ἅπτου); for I have not yet ascended to the Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them: I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God. 18. Mary Magdalene cometh announcing to the disciples that she has seen the Lord, and he spake these things unto her."[2] To those who attach weight to these narratives and consider them historical, it must appear astonishing that Mary, who up to the very last had been closely associated with Jesus, does not recognise him when he thus appears to her, but supposes him at first to be the gardener. As part of the evidence of the Gospel, however,

[1] This is the reading of the Vatican and Sinaitic codices, beside D and many other important MSS.

[2] John xx. 14—18.

such a trait is of much importance, and must hereafter be alluded to. After a couple of days not know Jesus whom she had daily seen for so long! The interpretation of the reply of Jesus, v. 17: "Touch me not," &c., has long been a bone of contention with critics, but it does not sufficiently affect the inquiry upon which we are engaged to require discussion here.[1] Only one point may be mentioned in passing, that if, as has been supposed in connection with Mt. xxviii. 9, Jesus be understood to repel, as premature, the worship of Mary, that very passage of the first Gospel, in which there is certainly no discouragement of worship, refutes the theory. We shall not say more about the construction of this dialogue, but we may point out that, as so many unimportant details are given throughout the narrative, it is somewhat remarkable that the scene terminates so abruptly, and leaves so much untold that it would have been of the utmost consequence for us to know. What became of Jesus, for instance? Did he vanish suddenly? or did he bid Mary farewell, and leave her like one in the flesh? Did she not inquire why he did not join the brethren? whither he was going? It is scarcely possible to tell us less than the writer has done; and as it cannot be denied that such minor points as where the linen clothes

[1] Those who desire to see some of the very conflicting opinions expressed may refer to: *Alford*, Gk. Test., i. p. 908; *Baur*, Unters. Kan. Evv., p. 221 ff.; *Ewald*, Die johann. Schr., i. p. 417; *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 435, n. 1; *Gebhardt*, Die Auferstehung Christi, 1864, p. 59 f.; *Gfrörer*, Das Heiligthum, p. 108 f.; *Godet*, L'Ev. de St. Jean, ii. p. 646 ff.; *Hengstenberg*, Ev. Johann., iii. p. 302 ff.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 560, anm. 1; *Lange*, Das Ev. Joh., p. 418 f.; *Lücke*, Ev. Joh., ii. p. 783 ff.; *Luthardt*, Das joh. Ev., ii. p. 504 ff.; *Meyer*, Ev. Joh., p. 648 ff.; *Olshausen*, Leidensgesch., p. 207 ff.; *Schleiermacher*, Vorles., ap. Strauss, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1863, p. 397; *Steinmeyer*, Auferstehungsgesch. des Herrn, 1871, p. 79, anm.; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu, p. 606; *de Wette*, Ev. Johann., p. 315 ff.; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., ii. p. 394 ff.

lay, or whether Mary "turned herself back" (v. 14) or "turned herself" (v. 16) merely, cannot be compared in interest and importance to the supposed movements and conduct of Jesus under such circumstances, the omission to relate the end of the interview, or more particular details of it, whilst those graphic touches are inserted, is singularly instructive. It is much more important to notice that here again there is no mention of Galilee, nor, indeed, of any intention to show himself to the disciples anywhere, but simply the intimation sent to them: "I ascend unto my Father and your Father," &c., a declaration which seems emphatically to exclude further "appearances," and to limit the vision of the risen Jesus to Mary Magdalene. Certainly this message implies in the clearest way that the ascension was then to take place, and the only explanation of the abrupt termination of the scene immediately after this is said is, that, as he spoke, Jesus then ascended. The subsequent appearances related in this Gospel must, consequently, either be regarded as an after-thought, or as visions of Jesus after he had ascended. This demands serious attention. We shall see that after sending this message to his disciples he is represented as appearing to them on the evening of the very same day.

According to the third Synoptic, the first appearance of Jesus to any one after the Resurrection was not to the women, and not to Mary Magdalene, but to two brethren,[1] who were not apostles at all, the name of one of whom, we are told, was Cleopas.[2] The story of the walk to Emmaus is very dramatic and interesting, but it is clearly legendary.[3] None of the other Evangelists

[1] Luke xxiv. 13—34. [2] Ib., verse 18.

[3] *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 545; *Scholten*, Het paulin. Ev., p. 344 ff.;

seems to know anything of it. It is difficult to suppose that Jesus should after his resurrection appear first of all to two unknown Christians in such a manner, and accompany them in such a journey. The particulars of the story are to the last degree improbable, and in its main features incredible, and it is indeed impossible to consider them carefully without perceiving the transparent inauthenticity of the narrative. The two disciples were going to a village called Emmaus threescore furlongs distant from Jerusalem, and while they are conversing Jesus joins them, "but their eyes were holden that they should not know him." He asks the subject of their discourse, and pretends ignorance, which surprises them. Hearing the expression of their perplexity and depression, he says to them: 25. "O foolish and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets spake. 26. Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things, and enter into his glory? 27. And beginning at Moses and at all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." When they reach the village, he pretends to be going further (v. 28), but they constrain him to stay. 30. "And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them he took the bread and blessed and brake, and gave to them; 31. and their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight." Now why all this comedy? why were their eyes holden that they should not know him? why pretend ignorance? why make "as though he would go further?" Considering the nature and number of the alleged appearances of Jesus, this episode seems most disproportionate and

d'Eichthal, Les Evangiles, ii. p. 313 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 365 ff.

inexplicable. The final incident completes our conviction of the unreality of the whole episode: after the sacramental blessing and breaking of bread, Jesus vanishes in a manner which removes the story from the domain of history. On their return to Jerusalem, the Synoptist adds that they find the Eleven, and are informed that "the Lord was raised and was seen by Simon." Of this appearance we are not told anything more.

Whilst the two disciples from Emmaus were relating these things to the eleven, the third Synoptist states that Jesus himself stood in the midst of them: v. 37. "But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they saw a spirit." The apparent intention is to represent a miraculous sudden entry of Jesus into the midst of them, just as he had vanished at Emmaus; but, in order to re-assure them, Jesus is represented as saying: v. 39. "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and behold, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me having. 41. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them: Have ye here any food? 42. And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish.[1] 43. And he took it and did eat before them." The care with which the writer demonstrates that Jesus rose again with his own body is remarkable, for not only does he show his hands and feet, we may suppose for the purpose of exhibiting the wounds made by the nails by which he was affixed to the cross, but he eats, and thereby proves himself to be still possessed of his human organism. It is apparent, however, that there is direct contradiction between this and the representation of his vanishing at Emmaus,

[1] We omit καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου, which is not found in the most ancient codices.

and standing in the midst of them now. The Synoptist who is so lavish in his use of miraculous agency naturally sees no incongruity here. One or other alternative must be adopted:—If Jesus possessed his own body after his resurrection and could eat and be handled, he could not vanish; if he vanished, he could not have been thus corporeal. The aid of a miracle has to be invoked in order to reconcile the representations. We need not here criticise the address which he is supposed to make to the disciples,[1] but we must call attention to the one point that Jesus (v. 49) commands the disciples to tarry in Jerusalem until they be "clothed with power from on high." This completes the exclusion of all appearances in Galilee, for the narrative proceeds to say, that Jesus led them out towards Bethany and lifted up his hands and blessed them: v. 51. "And it came to pass, while blessing them, he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven;" whilst they returned to Jerusalem, where they "were continually in the temple" praising God. We shall return to the Ascension presently, but, in the meantime, it is well that we should refer to the accounts of the other two Gospels.

According to the fourth Gospel, on the first day of the week, after sending to his disciples the message regarding his Ascension, which we have discussed, when it was evening: xx. 19. "And the doors having being shut where the disciples were, for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst, and saith unto them: Peace be unto you. 20. And having said this, he

[1] The statement in xxiv. 44, however, is suggestive as showing how the fulfilment of the Prophets and Psalms is in the mind of the writer. We have seen how much this idea influenced the account of the Passion in the Gospels.

showed unto them both his hands and his side. The disciples, therefore, rejoiced when they saw the Lord. 21. So then he said to them again: Peace be unto you: as the Father hath sent me, I also send you. 22. And when he said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit: 23. Whosesoever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto them; whosesoever ye retain they are retained." This appearance of Jesus to the eleven bears so far analogy to that in the third Gospel, which we have just examined, that it occurs upon the same day and to the same persons. Is it probable that Jesus appeared twice upon the same evening to the eleven disciples? The account in the fourth Gospel itself confirms the only reasonable reply: that he did not do so; but the narrative in the third Synoptic renders the matter certain. That appearance was the first to the eleven (xxiv. 36 f.), and he then conducted them towards Bethany, and ascended into heaven (v. 50 f.). How then, we may inquire, could two accounts of the same event differ so fundamentally? It is absolutely certain that both cannot be true. Is it possible to suppose that the third Synoptist could forget to record the extraordinary powers supposed to have been on this occasion bestowed upon the ten Apostles to forgive sins and to retain them? Is it conceivable that he would not relate the circumstance that Jesus breathed upon them, and endowed them with the Holy Ghost? Indeed, as regards the latter point, he seems to exclude it, v. 49, and in the Acts (ii.) certainly represents the descent of the Holy Spirit as taking place at Pentecost. On the other hand, can we suppose that the fourth Evangelist would have ignored the walk to Bethany and the solemn parting there? or the injunction to remain in Jerusalem?

not to mention other topics. The two episodes cannot be reconciled. In the fourth Gospel, instead of showing his hands and feet, Jesus is represented as exhibiting "his hands and his side," and that this is not accidental is most clearly demonstrated by the fact that Thomas, who is not present, refuses to believe (v. 25) unless he see and put his finger into the print of the nails in his hands and put his hand into his side; and Jesus, when he appears again, allows him (v. 27) to put his finger into his hands and his hand into his side. In the Synoptic, the wound made by that mythical lance is ignored and, in the fourth Gospel, the wounds in the feet. The omission of the whole episode of the leg-breaking and lance-thrust by the three Synoptics thus gains fresh significance. On the other hand, it may be a question whether, in the opinion of the fourth Evangelist, the feet of Jesus were nailed to the cross at all, or whether, indeed, they were so in fact. It was at least as common, not to say more, that the hands alone of those who were crucified were nailed to the cross, the legs being simply bound to it by cords. Opinion is divided as to whether Jesus was so bound or whether the feet were likewise nailed, but the point is not important to our examination and need not be discussed, although it has considerable interest in connection with the theory that death did not actually ensue on the cross, but that, having fainted through weakness, Jesus, being taken down after so unusually short a time on the cross, subsequently recovered. There is no final evidence upon the point. None of the explanations offered by apologists remove the contradiction between the statement that Jesus bestowed the Holy Spirit upon this occasion and that of the third Synoptic and Acts. There is, however, a curious point to notice in

connection with this: Thomas is said to have been absent upon this occasion, and the representation, therefore, is that the Holy Spirit was only bestowed upon ten of the Apostles. Was Thomas excluded? Was he thus punished for his unbelief? Are we to suppose that an opportunity to bestow the Holy Spirit was selected when one of the Apostles was not present?[1] We have, however, somewhat anticipated the narrative (xx. 24 ff.), which relates that upon the occasion above discussed Thomas, one of the Twelve, was not present, and hearing from the rest that they have seen the Lord, he declares that he will not believe without palpable proof by touching his wounds. The Evangelist continues: v. 26. "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas was with them. Jesus cometh, the doors having been shut (*τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων*), and stood in the midst and said: Peace be unto you. 27. Then saith he to Thomas: Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and put it into my side, and be not unbelieving but believing. 28. Thomas answered and said unto him: My Lord and my God. 29. Jesus saith unto him: Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed." The third Synoptic gives evidence that the risen Jesus is not incorporeal by stating that he not only permitted himself to be handled, but actually ate food in their presence. The fourth Evangelist attains the same result in a more artistic manner through the doubts of Thomas, but in allowing him actually to put his finger into the prints of the nails in his hands, and his hand into the wound in his side, he asserts that Jesus rose with the same body as that which

[1] Cf. *Lücke*, Comment. üb. das Ev. des Joh., ii. p. 797 ff.

had hung on the cross. He, too, however, whilst doing this, actually endows him with the attribute of incorporeality; for, upon both of the occasions which we are discussing, the statement is markedly made that, when Jesus came and stood in the midst, the doors were shut where the disciples were. It can scarcely be doubted that the intention of the writer is to represent a miraculous entry.[1] We are asked, however, to believe that when Thomas had convinced himself that it was indeed Jesus in the flesh who stood before him, he went to the opposite extreme of belief and said to Jesus: (καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ) "My Lord and my God!" In representing that Jesus, even before the Ascension, was addressed as "God" by one of the Twelve, the Evangelist commits one of those anachronisms with which we are familiar, in another shape, in the works of great painters, who depict pious bishops of their own time as actors in the scenes of the Passion. These touches, however, betray the hand of the artist, and remove the account from the domain of sober history. In the message sent by Jesus to his disciples he spoke of ascending "to your God and my God," but the Evangelist at the close of his Gospel strikes the same note as that upon which he commenced his philosophical prelude. We shall only add one further remark regarding this episode, and it is the repetition of one already made. It is much to be regretted that the writer does not inform us how these interviews of Jesus with his disciples terminated. We are told of his entry, but not of his mode of departure. Did he vanish suddenly? Did

[1] *Alford*, Gk. Test, i. p. 909; *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 587; *Godet* L'Ev. de St. Jean, ii. p. 609 f.; *Hengstenberg*, Ev. Joh., iii. p. 309 f.; *Luthardt*, Das joh. Ev., ii. p. 509; *Meyer*, Ev. Joh., p. 653 f.; *Wordsworth*, Gk. Test., Four Gospels, p. 360.

he depart like other men? Then, it would be important to know where Jesus abode during the interval of eight days. Did he ascend to heaven after each appearance? or did he remain on earth? Why did he not consort as before with his disciples? These are not jeering questions, but serious indications of the scantiness of the information given by the Evangelists, which is not compensated by some trifling detail of no value occasionally inserted to heighten the reality of a narrative. This is the last appearance of Jesus related in the fourth Gospel; for the character of Ch. xxi. is too doubtful[1] to permit it to rank with the Gospel. The appearance of Jesus therein related is in fact more palpably legendary than the others. It will be observed that in this Gospel, as in the third Synoptic, the appearances of Jesus are confined to Jerusalem and exclude Galilee. These two Gospels are, therefore, clearly in contradiction with the statement of the first two Synoptics.[2]

It only remains for us to refer to one more appearance of Jesus: that related in the first Synoptic, xxviii. 16 ff. In obedience to the command of Jesus, the disciples are represented as having gone away into Galilee, "unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them." We have not previously heard anything of this specific appointment. The Synoptist continues: v 17. "And when they saw him they worshipped him, but some doubted. 18. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying: All authority was given to me (ἐδόθη μοι) in heaven and on earth. 19. Go ye and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; 20. teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with

[1] Cf. S. R., 6th ed., ii. p. 431 ff. [2] Mt. xxviii. 7; Mk. xvi. 7.

you all the days, unto the end of the world." This appearance not only is not mentioned in the other Gospels, but it excludes the appearances in Judæa, of which the writer seems to be altogether ignorant. If he knew of them, he practically denies them. There has been some discussion as to what the doubt mentioned in v. 17 refers, some critics maintaining that "some doubted" as to the propriety of worshipping Jesus, whilst others more correctly consider that they doubted as to his identity,[1] but we need not mention the curious apologetic explanations offered.[2] Are we to regard the mention of these doubts as an "inestimable proof of the candour of the Evangelists"? If so, then we may find fault with the omission to tell us whether, and how, those doubts were set at rest. As the narrative stands the doubts were not resolved. Was it possible to doubt without good reason of the identity of one with whom, until a few days previously, the disciples had been in daily and hourly contact at least for a year, if not longer? Doubt in such a case is infinitely more decisive than belief. We can regard the expression, however, in no other light than as a mere rhetorical device in a legendary narrative. The rest of the account need have little further discussion here. The extraordinary statement in v. 18[3] seems as clearly

[1] *Alford*, Gk. Test., i. p. 305; *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 445, n. 1; *Meyer*, Ev. Matth. p. 616; *Scholten*, Het Ev. n. Joh. p. 353.

[2] Dr. Farrar makes the following remarks on this point: "The οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν of Matt. xxviii. 17, can only mean 'but some doubted,'—not as Wetstein and others take it, whether they should worship or not, but respecting the whole scene. All may not have stood near to Him, and even if they did, we have seen in four previous instances (Mt. xxviii. 17, Luke xxiv. 16, 37; John xxi. 4), that there was something unusual and not instantly recognizable in His resurrection body. At any rate, here we have another inestimable proof of the candour of the Evangelists, for there is nothing to be said in favour of the conjectural emendation οὐδέ." Life of Christ, ii. 445, note 1.

[3] This is supposed to be a reference to Daniel, vii. 14.

the expression of later theology as the baptismal formula in v. 19, where the doctrine of the Trinity is so definitely expressed. Some critics suppose that the Eleven were not alone upon this occasion, but that either all the disciples of Jesus were present, or at least the 500 brethren [1] to whom Paul refers, 1 Cor. xv. 6. This mainly rests on the statement that "some doubted," for it is argued that, after the two previous appearances to the disciples in Jerusalem mentioned by the other Evangelists, it is impossible that the Eleven could have felt doubt, and consequently that others must have been present who had not previously been convinced. It is scarcely necessary to point out the utter weakness of such an argument. It is not permissible, however, to patch on to this Gospel scraps cut out of the others. It must be clear to every unprejudiced student that the appearances of Jesus narrated by the four Gospels in Galilee and Judæa cannot be harmonised,[2] and we have shown that they exclude each other.[3] The first Synoptist records (v. 10) the order for the disciples to go into Galilee, and with no further

[1] Dr. Farrar, without explanation or argument, boldly asserts the presence of the 500. Life of Christ, ii. 445.

[2] *Alford*, Gk. Test., i. p. 432, 904 f.; *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 432, n. 1; *Holtzmann*, Die synopt. Evv., p. 500 ff.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 533 ff.; *Krüger-Velthusen*, Leb. Jesu, p. 262 f.; *Meijboom*, Jezus' Opstand., p. 37 ff.; *Meyer*, Ev. Matth., p. 612 ff.; Ev. Joh., p. 643, anm.; *Olshausen*, Leidensgesch., p. 200 ff.; *Schenkel*, Bib. Lex., i. p. 292 f.; *Steinmeyer*, Auferstehungsgesch. d. Herrn, p. 59 ff.; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu, p. 292; *Westcott*, Int. to Study of the Gospels, 4th ed., p. 329 ff.

[3] Dean Alford, whilst admitting that it is fruitless to attempt a harmony of the different accounts, curiously adds: ". . . Hence the great diversity in this portion of the narrative:—and hence I believe much that is now dark might be explained, were the facts themselves, in their order of occurrence, before us. Till that is the case (and I am willing to believe that it will be one of our delightful employments hereafter, to trace the *true* harmony of the Holy Gospels, under His teaching of whom they are the record), we must be content to walk by faith, and not by sight." Gk. Test. on John xx. 1—29, i. p. 905.

interruption than the mention of the return of the discomfited guard from the sepulchre to the chief priest, he (v. 16) states that they went into Galilee, where they saw Jesus in the manner just described. No amount of ingenuity can insert the appearances in Jerusalem here without the grossest violation of all common sense. This is the only appearance to the Eleven recorded in Matthew. We must here again point out the singular omission to relate the manner in which this interview was ended. The episode and the Gospel, indeed, are brought to a very artistic close by the expression, "lo, I am with you all the days unto the end of the world," but we must insist that it is a very suggestive fact that it does not occur to these writers to state what became of Jesus. Surely no point could have been more full of interest than the manner in which Jesus here finally leaves the disciples, and is dismissed from the history. That such an important part of the narrative is omitted is in the highest degree remarkable and significant. Had a formal termination to the interview been recounted, it would have been subject to criticism, and by no means any evidence of truth; but it seems to us that the circumstance that it never occurred to these writers to relate the departure of Jesus is a very strong indication of the unreality and shadowy nature of the whole tradition.

We are thus brought to consider the account of the Ascension, which is at least given by one Evangelist. In the appendix to the second Gospel, as if the later writer felt the omission and desired to complete the narrative, it is vaguely stated: xvi. 19. "So then after the Lord spake unto them he was taken up into heaven and sat on the right hand of God."[1] The

[1] Cf. Ps. cx. 1.

writer, however, omits to state how he was taken up into heaven; and sitting "at the right hand of God" is an act and position which those who assert the "Personality of God" may possibly understand, but which we venture to think betrays that the account is a mere theological figment. The third Synoptist, however, as we have incidentally shown, gives an account of the Ascension. Jesus having, according to the narrative in xxiv. 50ff., led the disciples out to Bethany, lifted up his hands and blessed them: v. 51. "And it came to pass while blessing them he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven."[1] The whole of the appearances narrated in the third Synoptic, therefore, and the Ascension are thus said to occur on the same day as the Resurrection.[2] In Matthew, there is a different representation made, for the time consumed in the journey of the disciples to Galilee obviously throws back the Ascension to a later date. In Mark, there is no appearance at all recorded, but the command to the disciples to go into Galilee confirms the first Synoptic. In the fourth Gospel, Jesus revisits the eleven a second time after eight days; and, therefore, the Ascension is here

[1] The last phrase: "and was carried up into heaven," καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, is suspected by *Griesbach*, and omitted by *Tischendorf*, and pronounced inauthentic by some critics. The words are not found in the Sinaitic Codex and D, but are in the great majority of the oldest MSS., including the Alexandrian, and Vatican, C, F, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, &c., &c. The preponderance of authority is greatly in their favour. Compare also Acts i. 2.

[2] *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 93; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 373; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 539; *Meyer*, Ev. Mark u. Luk. 5te Aufl. p. 609, anm., p. 611 ff.; *Réville*, La Résurrection de Jésus-Christ, 1869, p. 9 f.; *Scholten*, Het Ev. n. Joh., p. 357 f.; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu, p. 292, 614; *Volkmar*, Die Rel. Jesu, p. 95; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., ii. p. 415. Cf. *de Wette*, Ev. Luc. u. Marc., p. 167.

necessarily later still. In neither of these Gospels, however, is there any account of an ascension at all. We may here point out that there is no mention of the Ascension in any of the genuine writings of Paul, and it would appear that the theory of a bodily ascension, in any shape, did not form part of the oldest Christian tradition.[1] The growth of the legend of the Ascension is apparent in the circumstance that the Author of the third Gospel follows a second tradition regarding that event when composing Acts.[2] Whether he thought a fuller and more detailed account desirable, or it seemed necessary to prolong the period during which Jesus remained on earth after his Resurrection, and to multiply his appearances, it is impossible to say, but the fact is that he does so. He states in his second work: that to the Apostles Jesus "presented himself alive after he suffered by many proofs, appearing (ὀπτανόμενος) to them during forty days, and speaking of the things concerning the Kingdom of God." It is scarcely possible to doubt that the period of forty days is suggested by the Old Testament[3] and the Hebrew use of that number, of which indeed we already find examples in the New Testament in the forty days temptation of Jesus in the wilderness,[4] and his fasting forty days and forty nights.[5] Why

[1] *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 97 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 373 ff; *Hase*, Leb. Jesu, p. 281 f.; *Keim*, Der geschichtl. Christus, 1866, p. 131; *Meyer*, Ev. Mark. u. Luk., p. 614; *Scholten*, Het Ev. Joh., p. 361 f.

[2] *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 539, 613, anm. 3; *Meyer*, Ev. Mark. u. Luk., p. 612 ff.; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu, p. 615.

[3] *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 539 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette Apg., p. 8 f.; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 12 f.; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu Krit. bearb. 4te Aufl., ii. p. 659; cf. i. p. 450.

[4] Mark i. 13; Luke iv. 2. [5] Mt. iv. 2.

Jesus remained on earth this typical period we are not told,[1] but the representation evidently is of much more prolonged and continuous intercourse with his disciples than any statements in the Gospels have led us to suppose, or than the declaration of Paul renders in the least degree probable. If indeed the account in Acts were true, the numbered appearances recited by Paul show singular ignorance of the phenomena of the Resurrection. We need not discuss the particulars of the last interview with the Apostles, (i. 4ff.) although they are singular enough, and are indeed elsewhere referred to, but at once proceed to the final occurrences: v. 9. "And when he had spoken these things, while they are looking he was lifted up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. 10. And as they were gazing stedfastly into the heaven as he went, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; 11. which also said: Men of Galilee (ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι), why stand ye looking into the heaven? This Jesus, who was taken up from you into the heaven, shall come in like manner as ye saw him going into the heaven. 12. Then returned they into Jerusalem," &c. A definite statement is here made of the mode in which Jesus finally ascended into heaven, and it presents some of the incongruities which might have been expected. The bodily Ascension up the sky in a cloud, apart from the miraculous nature of such an occurrence, seems singularly to localise "Heaven," and to present views of cosmical and celestial phenomena, suitable certainly to the age of the writer, but scarcely endorsed by modern science.

[1] The testimony of the Epistle of Barnabas (c. xv.) does not agree with this.

The sudden appearance of the "two men in white apparel," the usual description of angels, is altogether in the style of the Author of Acts, but does it increase the credibility of the story? It is curious that the angels open their address to the Apostles in the same form as almost every other speaker in this book. They adopt a style of thought and expression very suspiciously like that of the Author. One might ask, indeed, why such an angelic interposition should have taken place? for its utility is not apparent, and in the short sentence recorded nothing which is new is embodied. No surprise is expressed at the appearance of the angels, and nothing is said of their disappearance. They are introduced, like the chorus of a Greek play, and are left unceremoniously, with an indifference which betrays complete familiarity with supernatural agency. Can there be any doubt that the whole episode is legendary?[1]

It may not seem inappropriate to mention here that the idea of a bodily ascension does not originate with the Author of the third Synoptic and Acts, nor is it peculiar to Christianity. The translation of Enoch[2] had long been chronicled in the sacred books; and the ascent of Elijah[3] in his whirlwind and chariot of fire before the eyes of Elisha was another well-known instance. The vision of Daniel (vii. 13), of one like the "Son of man" coming with the clouds of heaven, might well have suggested the manner of his departure, but another

[1] *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 539 f; *Meyer*, Ev. Mark. u. Luk., p. 614; Apg., p. 32 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette Apg., 7 ff.; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu Kr. bearb., ii. p. 658 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 76 ff.

[2] Gen. v. 24; Ecclesiasticus xliv. 16, xlix. 14; Heb. xi. 5.

[3] 2 Kings ii. 11; Ecclesiasticus, xlviii. 9, 11.

mode has been suggested.[1] The Author of Acts was, we maintain, well acquainted with the works of Josephus. We know that the prophet like unto Moses was a favourite representation in Acts of the Christ. Now in the account which Josephus gives of the end of Moses, he states that, although he wrote in the holy books that he died lest they should say that he went to God, this was not really his end. After reaching the mountain Abarim he dismissed the senate; and as he was about to embrace Eleazar, the high priest, and Joshua, "a cloud suddenly having stood over him he disappeared in a certain valley."[2] This, however, we merely mention in passing.

Our earlier examination of the evidence for the origin and authorship of the historical books of the New Testament very clearly demonstrated that the testimony of these works for miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation, whatever that testimony might seem to be, could not be considered of any real value. We have now examined the accounts which the four Evangelists actually give of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, and there can be no hesitation in stating as the result that, as might have been expected from works of such uncertain character, these narratives must be pronounced mere legends, embodying vague and wholly unattested tradition. As evidence for such stupendous miracles, they are

[1] *Strauss*, Das Leben Jesu, p. 618.

[2] . . . . *νέφους αἰφνίδιον ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν στάντος ἀφανίζεται κατά τινος φάραγγος.* Antiq. Jud. iv. 8 § 48.

absolutely of no value. No reliance can be placed on a single detail of their story. The aim of the writers has obviously been to make their narrative of the various appearances of Jesus as convincing as possible,[1] and they have freely inserted any details which seemed to them calculated to give them impressiveness, force, and verisimilitude. A recent apologetic writer has said: "Any one who will attentively read side by side the narratives of these appearances on the first day of the resurrection, will see that they have only been preserved for us in general, interblended and scattered notices (see Matt. xxviii. 16; Luke xxiv. 34; Acts i. 3), which, in strict exactness, render it impossible, without many arbitrary suppositions, to produce from them a *certain* narrative of the order of events. The *lacunæ*, the compressions, the variations, the actual differences, *the subjectivity of the narrators as affected by spiritual revelations*, render all harmonies at the best uncertain."[2] Passing over without comment, the strange phrase in this passage which we have italicised, and which seems to claim divine inspiration for the writers, it must be obvious to any one who has carefully read the preceding pages that this is an exceedingly moderate description of the wild statements and irreconcilable contradictions of the different narratives we have examined. But such as it is, with all the glaring inconsistences and impossibilities of the accounts even thus subdued, is it possible for any one who has formed even a faint idea of the extraordinary nature of the allegations which have to be attested, to con-

[1] *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. 542.

[2] *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. 432, n. 1.

sider such documents really evidence for the Resurrection and bodily Ascension? The usual pleas which are advanced in mitigation of judgment against the Gospels for these characteristics are of no avail. It may be easy to excuse the writers for their mutual contradictions, but the pleas themselves are an admission of the shortcomings which render their evidence valueless. "The differences of purpose in the narrative of the four Evangelists,"[1] may be fancifully set forth, or ingeniously imagined, but no "purpose" can transform discordant and untrustworthy narratives into evidence for miracles. Unless the prologue to the third Gospel be considered a condemnation of any of the other Synoptics which may have existed before it, none of the Evangelists makes the smallest reference to any of his brethren or their works. Each Gospel tacitly professes to be a perfectly independent work, giving the history of Jesus, or at

[1] "Professor Westcott, with his usual profundity and insight, points out the differences of purpose in the narrative of the four Evangelists. St. Matthew dwells chiefly on the majesty and glory of the Resurrection; St. Mark, both in the original part and in the addition (Mark xvi. 9—20) insists upon it as *a fact;* St. Luke, as a *spiritual necessity;* St. John, as a touchstone of character. (*Introd.* 310—315.)" *Farrar*, Ib., ii. 432, n. 1. Dr. Westcott says: "The various narratives of the Resurrection place the fragmentariness of the Gospel in the clearest light. They contain difficulties which it is impossible to explain with certainty, but there is no less an intelligible fitness and purpose in the details peculiar to each account. . . . It is necessary to repeat these obvious remarks, because the records of the Resurrection have given occasion to some of the worst examples of that kind of criticism from which the other parts of the Gospels have suffered, though not in an equal degree. It is tacitly assumed that we are in possession of all the circumstances of the event, and thus, on the one hand differences are urged as fatal, and on the other elaborate attempts are made to show that the details given can be forced into the semblance of a complete and connected narrative. The true critic will pause before he admits either extreme." Int. to the Study of the Gospels, 4th ed., p. 329, 331.

least of the active part of his life, and of his death and Resurrection. The apologetic theory, derived from the Fathers, that the Evangelists designed to complete and supplement each other, is totally untenable. Each work was evidently intended to be complete in itself; but when we consider that much the greater part of the contents of each of the Synoptics is common to the three, frequently with almost literal agreement, and generally without sufficient alteration to conceal community of source or use of each other, the poverty of Christian tradition becomes painfully evident. We have already pointed out the fundamental difference between the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. In no part of the history does greater contradiction and disagreement between the three Synoptics themselves and likewise between them and the fourth Gospel exist, than in the account of the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension. It is impossible to examine the four narratives carefully without feeling that here tradition, for natural reasons, has been more than usually wavering and insecure. Each writer differs essentially from the rest, and the various narratives not only disagree but exclude each other. The third Synoptist, in the course of some years, even contradicts himself. The phenomena which are related, in fact, were too subjective and unsubstantial for sober and consistent narrative, and free play was allowed for pious imagination to frame details by the aid of supposed Messianic utterances of the Prophets and Psalmists of Israel. Such a miracle as the Resurrection, startling as it is in our estimation, was common-place enough in the view of these writers. We need not go back to discuss the story of the widow's son restored to

life by Elijah,[1] nor that of the dead man who revived on touching the bones of Elisha.[2] The raising from the dead of the son of the widow of Nain[3] did not apparently produce much effect at the time, and only one of the Evangelists seems to have thought it worth while to preserve the narrative. The case of Jairus' daughter,[4] whatever it was, is regarded as a resurrection of the dead and is related by two of the Synoptists; but the raising of Lazarus is only recorded by the fourth Evangelist. The familiarity of the age with the idea of the resurrection of the dead, however, according to the Synoptists, is illustrated by the representation which they give of the effect produced by the fame of Jesus upon Herod and others. We are told by the first Synoptist that Herod said unto his servants: "This is John the Baptist; he was raised from the dead; and therefore the powers work in him."[5] The second Synoptist repeats the same statement, but adds: "But others said that it is Elijah; and others said that it is a prophet like one of the prophets."[6] The statement of the third Synoptist is somewhat different. He says: "Now Herod the tetrarch heard all that was occurring: and he was perplexed because it was said by some that John was raised from the dead, and by some that Elijah appeared, and by others that one of the old prophets rose up. And Herod

[1] 1 Kings xvii. 17 ff.
[2] 2 Kings xiii. 21.
[3] Luke vii. 11 ff.
[4] Mk. v. 35 ff.; Luke viii. 49 ff.
[5] *καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ, Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής· αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ.* Mt. xiv. 2; cf. Mk. vi. 14.
[6] *ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἠλίας ἐστίν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι προφήτης, ὡς εἷς τῶν προφητῶν.* Mk. vi. 15.

said: John I beheaded, but who is this of whom I hear such things, and he sought to see him."[1] The three Synoptists substantially report the same thing; the close verbal agreement of the first two being an example of the community of matter of which we have just spoken. The variations are instructive as showing the process by which each writer made the original form his own. Are we to assume that these things were really said? Or must we conclude that the sayings are simply the creation of later tradition? In the latter case, we see how unreal and legendary are the Gospels. In the former case, we learn how common was the belief in a bodily resurrection. How could it seem so strange to the Apostles that Jesus should rise again, when the idea that John the Baptist or one of the old prophets had risen from the dead was so readily accepted by Herod and others? How could they so totally misunderstand all that the chief priests, according to the first Synoptic, so well understood of the teaching of Jesus on the subject of his Resurrection, since the world had already become so familiar with the idea and the fact? Then that episode of the Transfiguration must have occurred to every one, when Jesus took with him Peter and James and John into a high mountain apart, "and he was transfigured before them; and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment became white as the light. And behold, there was seen (ὤφθη) by them Moses and Elijah

[1] 7. Ἤκουσεν δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετράρχης τὰ γιγόμενα πάντα, καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπό τινων ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, 8. ὑπό τινων δὲ ὅτι Ἠλίας ἐφάνη, ἄλλων δὲ ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη. 9. εἶπεν δὲ Ἡρώδης· Ἰωάννην ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα· τίς δὲ ἐστιν οὗτος περὶ οὗ ἐγὼ ἀκούω τοιαῦτα; καὶ ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν. Luke ix. 7–9.

talking with him;" and then "a bright cloud overshadowed them" and "a voice came out of the cloud: This is my beloved son," &c. "And when the disciples heard they fell on their face and were sore afraid."[1] The third Synoptist even knows the subject of their conversation: "They were speaking of his decease which he was about to fulfil in Jerusalem."[2] This is related by all as an objective occurrence.[3] Are we to accept it as such? Then how is it possible that the disciples could be so obtuse and incredulous as they subsequently showed themselves to be regarding the person of Jesus, and his resurrection? How could the announcement to the women by the angels of that event seem to them as an idle tale, which they did not believe?[4] Here were Moses and Elijah before them, and in Jesus, we are told, they recognized one greater than Moses and Elijah. The miracle of the Resurrection was here again anticipated and made palpable to them. Are we to regard the Transfiguration as a subjective vision? Then why not equally so the appearances of Jesus after his passion? We can regard the Transfiguration, however, as nothing more than an allegory without either objective or subjective reality. Into this at present we cannot further go. It is sufficient to repeat that our examination has shown the Gospels to possess no value as evidence for the Resurrection and Ascension. The account of these events cannot be regarded as History.

[1] Mt. xvii. 1 ff.; cf. Mk. ix. 2 ff.; Luke ix. 28 ff. Nothing could be more instructive than a careful comparison of the three narratives of this occurrence and of the curious divergences and amplifications of a common original introduced by successive editors. [2] Luke ix. 31.

[3] We need not here speak of the the use of the verb ὁράω.

[4] Luke xxiv. 11.

CHAPTER III.

THE EVIDENCE OF PAUL.

We may now proceed to examine the evidence of Paul. "On one occasion," it is affirmed in a passage already quoted, "he gives a very circumstantial account of the testimony upon which the belief in the Resurrection rested (1 Cor. xv. 4—8)."[1] This account is as follows: 1 Cor. xv. 3. "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, 4. and that he was buried, and that he has been raised (*ἐγήγερται*) the third day according to the Scriptures, 5. and that he was seen by Cephas, then by the Twelve. 6. After that, he was seen by above five hundred brethren at once (*ἐφάπαξ*), of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. 7. After that, he was seen by James; then by all the Apostles. 8. And last of all he was seen by me also as the one born out of due time."[2] Can this be considered a "very circumstantial account"? It may be exceedingly unreasonable, but we must at once acknowledge that we are not satisfied. The testimony

[1] *Sanday*, The Gospels in the Second Century, p. 12.

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 3. *παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς,* 4. *καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη, καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς,* 5. *καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾷ, εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα.* 6. *ἔπειτα ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ, ἐξ ὧν οἱ πλείονες μένουσιν ἕως ἄρτι, τινὲς δὲ ἐκοιμήθησαν.* 7. *ἔπειτα ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ, ἔπειτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν.* 8. *ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὤφθη κἀμοί.*

upon which the belief in the Resurrection rests comprised in a dozen lines! for we may so far anticipate as to say that this can scarcely be regarded as a *resumé* of evidence which we can find elsewhere. We shall presently point out a few circumstances which it might be useful to know.

The Apostle states in this passage that the doctrines which he had delivered to the Corinthians he had himself "received." He does not pretend to teach them from his own knowledge, and the question naturally arises: From whom did he "receive" them? Formerly, divines generally taught that Paul received these doctrines by revelation, and up to recent times apologists have continued to hold this view, even when admitting the subsidiary use of tradition.[1] If this claim were seriously made, the statements of the Apostle, so far as our inquiry is concerned, would certainly not gain in value, for it is obvious that Revelation could not be admitted to prove Revelation. It is quite true that Paul himself professed to have received his Gospel not from men, but from God by direct revelation, and we shall hereafter have to consider this point and the inferences to be drawn from such pretensions. At present the argument need not be complicated by any such supposition, for certainly Paul does not here advance any such claim himself, and apologetic and other critics agree in declaring the source of his statements to be natural historical tradition.[2] The points which he

[1] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 602; *Bisping*, Erkl. 1 Br. an die Kor. 2te Aufl., p. 264; *Maier*, 1 Br. an die Kor., 1857, p. 336; *Neander*, Br. an die Cor., 1859, p. 239; *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm., iii. 2te Aufl., p. 733 f.; *Osiander*, 1 Br. an die Kor., 1847, p. 676 f.; *Rückert*, 1 Br. an die Kor., 1836, p. 389.

[2] *Ewald*, Sendschr. d. Ap. Paulus, p. 207 f.; *Hofmann*, Die heil. Schr. N. T., ii. 2, p. 348; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 546; *Meyer*, 1 Br. an die

delivered and which he had also received are three in number: (1) that Christ died for our sins; (2) that he was buried; and (3) that he has been raised the third day. In strictness the καὶ ὅτι might oblige us to include, "and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve," after which the construction of the sentence is changed. It is not necessary to press this, however, and it is better for the present to separate the dogmatic statements from those which are more properly evidential. It will be observed that, although the death, burial, and resurrection are here taught as "received," evidence only of one point is offered: that Jesus "was seen by" certain persons. We have already pointed out that the Gospels do not pretend that any one was an eye-witness of the Resurrection itself, and it is important to notice that Paul, the earliest and most reliable witness produced, entirely passes over the event itself, and relies solely on the fact that Jesus was supposed to have been seen by certain persons to prove that he died, was buried, and had actually risen the third day. The only inference which we here wish to draw from this is, that the alleged appearances are thus obviously separated from the death and burial by a distinct gulf. A dead body, it is stated, or one believed to be dead, is laid in a sepulchre: after a certain time, it is alleged that the dead person has been seen alive. Supposing the first statement to be correct, the second, being in itself, according to all our experience, utterly incredible, leaves further a serious gap in the continuity of evidence. What occurred in the interval between the burial and the supposed apparition? If it be asserted—as in the Gospels it is—that, before the

Kor. 5te Aufl., p. 414; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, iv. p. 201. Cf. *Rückert*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 389.

apparition, the sepulchre was found empty and the body gone, not only may it be replied that this very circumstance may have assisted in producing a subjective vision, but that, in so far as the disappearance of the body is connected with the appearance of the person apparently alive, the fact has no evidential value. The person supposed to be dead, for instance, may actually not have been so, but have revived; for, although we have no intention ourselves of adopting this explanation of the Resurrection, it is, as an alternative, certainly preferable to belief in the miracle. Or, in the interval, the body may have been removed from a temporary to a permanent resting place unknown to those who are surprised to find the body gone;—and in the Gospels the conflicting accounts of the embalming and hasty burial, as we have seen, would fully permit of such an argument if we relied at all on those narratives. Many other means of accounting for the absence of the body might be advanced, any one of which, in the actual default of testimony to the contrary, would be irrefutable. The mere surprise of finding a grave empty which was supposed to contain a body betrays a blank in the knowledge of the persons, which can only be naturally filled up. This gap, at least, would not have existed had the supposed resurrection occurred in the presence of those by whom it is asserted Jesus "was seen." As it is, no evidence whatever is offered that Jesus really died; no evidence that the sepulchre was even found empty; no evidence that the dead body actually arose and became alive again; but skipping over the intermediate steps, the only evidence produced is the statement that, being supposed to be dead, he is said to have been seen by certain persons.[1]

[1] The curious account in Matthew, xxviii. 1 ff., of the earthquake and

There is a peculiarity in the statement to which we must now refer. The words, "according to the Scriptures" (*κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*) are twice introduced into the brief recapitulation of the teaching which Paul had received and delivered: (1) "That Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," and (3) "that he has been raised the third day according to the Scriptures." It is evident that mere historical tradition has only to do with the fact "that Christ died," and that the object: "for our sins," is a dogmatic addition. The Scriptures certainly supply the dogma. In the second point, the appeal to Scripture is curious, and so far important as indicating that the resurrection on the third day was supposed to be a fulfilment of prophecy; and we have thus an indication, regarding which we must hereafter speak, of the manner in which the belief probably originated. The double reference to the Scriptures is peculiarly marked, and we have already more than once had occasion to point out that the narratives of the Gospels betray the very strong and constant influence of parts of the Old Testament supposed to relate to the Messiah. It cannot, we think, be doubted by any independent critic, that the details of these narratives were to a large extent traced from those prophecies. It is in the highest degree natural to suppose that the early Christians, once accepting the idea of a suffering Messiah, should, in the absence of positive or minute knowledge, assume that prophecies which they believed to have reference to him should actually have been fulfilled, and that in fact the occurrences corresponded minutely with the prophecies. Too little is known of what really took place, and it is

rolling away of the stone by an angel in the presence of the women, who nevertheless saw no resurrection, will not be forgotten.

probable that Christian tradition generally was moulded from foregone conclusions. Now, what were the "Scriptures," according to which "Christ died for our sins," and "has been raised the third day?" The passages which are generally referred to, and which Paul most probably had in view, are well known: as regards the death for our sins,—Isaiah liii., Ps. xxii. and lxix.; and for the resurrection,—Ps. xvi. 10, and Hosea vi. 2. Now we have already pointed out that historical criticism has shown that the first four passages just indicated are not Messianic prophecies at all,[1] and we may repeat that the idea of a suffering Messiah was wholly foreign to the Jewish prophets and people. The Messiah "crucified," as Paul himself bears witness, was "to Jews a stumbling block,"[2] and modern criticism has clearly established that the parts of Scripture by which the early Christians endeavoured to show that such a Messiah had been foretold can only be applied by a perversion of the original signification. In the case of the passages supposed to foretell the Resurrection, the misapplication is particularly flagrant. We have already discussed the use of Ps. xvi. 10, which in Acts[3] is put into the mouth of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and shown that the proof passage rests upon a mistranslation of the original in the Septuagint.[4] Any reader who will refer to Hosea vi. 2 will see that the passage in no way applies to the Messiah,[5] although undoubtedly it has influenced the formation of the doctrine of the Resurrection. The "sign of the prophet Jonah,"

[1] See references p. 442, notes 1, 2, p. 443, notes 1, 2, and p. 106 f., and p. 84, note 1.

[2] 1 Cor. i. 23 [3] ii. 25 ff., xiii. 35 ff. [4] p. 82.

[5] *Kuenen*, De Profeten en de Profetie onder Israël, 1875, ii. 293. Compare, generally, the excellent chapters on the N. T. and Old Test. prophecy, pp. 199—318.

which in Mt. xii. 40 is put into the mouth of Jesus is another passage used with equal incorrectness, and a glimpse of the manner in which Christian tradition took shape, and the Gospels were composed, may be obtained by comparing with the passage in the first Synoptic the parallel in the third (xi. 29—31).[1] We shall have more to say presently regarding the resurrection "on the third day."

We may now proceed to examine the so-called "very circumstantial account of the testimony on which the belief in the Resurrection rested." "And that he was seen by Cephas, then by the Twelve. After that he was seen by above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that he was seen by James, then by all the Apostles, and last of all he was seen by me also."[2] There can be no doubt, we think, from the terms in which this statement is made, that Paul intended to give the appearances in chronological order.[3] It would likewise be a fair inference that he intended to mention all the appearances of which he was aware. So far, the account may possibly merit the epithet "circumstantial," but in all other respects it is scarcely possible to conceive any statement less circumstantial. As to where the risen Jesus was seen by these persons, in what manner, and under what circumstances, and at what time, we are not vouchsafed a single particular. Moreover, the Apostle was not present on any of these occasions, excepting of course

[1] Cf. Mt. xvi. 4; Mk. viii. 11. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 5—8.

[3] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 603; *Keim*, Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 543; *Maier*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 337; *Meyer*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 416; *Rückert*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 390; *Stanley*, St. Paul's Ep. to the Cor., 4th ed., p. 288; *de Wette*, Br. an die Kor., 1855, p. 141; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., ii. p. 364.

his own vision, and consequently merely reports appearances of which he has been informed by others, but he omits to mention the authority upon which he makes these statements, or what steps he took to ascertain their accuracy and reality. For instance, when Jesus is said to have been seen by five hundred brethren at once, it would have been of the highest importance for us to know the exact details of the scene, the proportion of inference to fact, the character of the Apostle's informant, the extent of the investigation into the various impressions made upon the individuals composing the five hundred, as opposed to the collective affirmation. We confess that we do not attach much value to such appeals to the experience of 500 persons at once. It is difficult to find out what the actual experience of the individuals was, and each individual is so apt to catch the infection of his neighbour, and join in excitement, believing that, though he does not himself see or feel anything, his neighbour does, that it is probable, when inquiry is pressed home, the aggregate affirmation of a large number may resolve itself into the actual experience of very few. The fact is, however, that in this "very circumstantial account" we have nothing whatever except a mere catalogue by Paul of certain appearances which he did not himself see—always excepting his own vision, which we reserve—but merely had "received" from others, without a detail or information of any kind.

If we compare these appearances with the instances recorded in the Gospels, the result is by no means satisfactory. The first appearance is said to be to Cephas. It is argued that Paul passes in silence over the appearances to women, both because the testimony of women was not received in Jewish courts and because his own

opinions regarding the active participation of women in matters connected with the Church were of a somewhat exclusive character.[1] The appearance to Cephas is generally identified with that mentioned Luke xxiv. 34.[2] Nothing could be more cursory than the manner in which this appearance is related in the Synoptic. The disciples from Emmaus, returning at once to Jerusalem, found the Eleven and those who were with them saying: "The Lord was raised indeed, and was seen by Simon." Not another syllable is said regarding an appearance which, according to Paul, was the first which had occurred. The other Gospels say still less, for they ignore the incident altogether. It is difficult to find room for such an appearance in the Gospel narratives. If we take the report of Paul to be true, that Jesus was first seen by Cephas, the silence of three Evangelists and their contradictory representations, on the one hand, and the remarkable way in which the third Gospel avoids all but the mere indirect reference to the occurrence, on the other, are phenomena which we leave apologists to explain.[3] He is next seen "by the Twelve." This vision is identified with that narrated in John xx. 19 ff. and Luke xxiv. 36 ff.,[4] to which, as Thomas was absent on the first occasion, some critics understand the episode in John xx. 26 ff. to be added. On reference to our discussion of these accounts, it will be seen that they have few or no elements of credi-

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 34 ff.

[2] So Bisping, Maier, Meyer, Neander, Osiander, Rückert, Stanley, de Wette, &c., &c., in l.

[3] *Gfrörer* thinks the germ of Paul's incident to lie in the statement John xx. 4, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 376 f. *Dr. Farrar* thinks the details "may have been of a nature too personal to have been revealed." Life of Christ, ii. p. 437.

[4] So Bisping, Maier, Meyer, Neander, Osiander, Stanley, de Wette, &c., &c., in l.

bility. If the appearance to the Twelve mentioned by Paul be identified with these episodes, and their details be declared authentic, the second item in Paul's list becomes discredited. The appearance to 500 brethren at once is not mentioned in any of the Gospels, but critics, and especially apologetic critics, assert with more or less of certainty the identity of the occasion with the scene described in Matth. xxviii. 16 ff.[1] We remarked whilst discussing the passage that this is based chiefly on the statement that "some doubted," which would have been inconsistent, it is thought, had Jesus already appeared to the Eleven.[2] The identity is, however, denied by others.[3] The narrative in the first Synoptic would scarcely add force to the report in the Epistle. Is it possible to suppose, however, that, had there been so large a number of persons collected upon that occasion, the Evangelist would not have mentioned the fact? On the other hand, does it not somewhat discredit the statement that Jesus was seen by so large a number at once, that no record of such a remarkable occurrence exists elsewhere?[4] How could the tradition of such an event, witnessed by so many, have so completely perished that neither in the Gospels nor Acts, nor in any other writing, is there any reference to it, and

[1] So Grotius, Maier, Osiander, Wordsworth, &c., ad l. *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 591 f., 599; zu Olsh. Leidensgesch., p. 210; *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 445. Cf. *Olshausen*, Leidensgesch., p. 227. *Stanley*, Corinthians, p. 288.

[2] *Beyschlag*, considers that, in these doubts, we have clearly an erroneous mixing up of the story of Thomas, John xx. 24 ff., and he thinks that probably in the incident of Jesus eating fish, described by the third Synoptic (xxiv. 42), we have a reminiscence of John xxi. 13. Stud. u. Kr., 1870, p. 218, anm.

[3] Alford, Bisping, Hofmann, Meyer, de Wette, &c., &c., in l.

[4] *Hausrath* (Der Ap. Paulus, p. 101 f.) and some others are disposed to identify the supposed appearance to 500 with the occurrence at Pentecost, Acts ii.

our only knowledge of it is this bare statement, without a single detail? There is only one explanation: that the assembly could not have recognized in the phenomenon, whatever it was, the risen Jesus,[1] or that subsequently an explanation was given which dispelled some temporary illusion. In any case, we must insist that the total absence of all confirmation of an appearance to 500 persons at once alone renders such an occurrence more than suspicious. The statement that the greater number were still living when Paul wrote does not materially affect the question. Paul doubless believed the report that such an appearance had taken place, and that the majority of witnesses still survived, but does it necessarily follow that the report was true? The survivers were certainly not within reach of the Corinthians, and could not easily be questioned. The whole of the argument of Paul which we are considering, as well as that which follows, was drawn from him by the fact that, in Corinth, Christians actually denied a resurrection, and it is far from clear that this denial did not extend to denying the Resurrection of Jesus himself.[2] That they did deny this we think certain, from the care with which Paul gives what he considers evidence for the fact. Another point may be mentioned. Where could so many as 500 disciples have been collected at one time? The Author of Acts states (i. 15) the number of the Christian community gathered together to elect a successor to Judas as "about 120." Apologists, therefore, either suppose the appearance to 500 to have taken place in Jerusalem, when numbers of pilgrims

[1] *Weisse*, Die evang. Gesh., ii. p. 416.

[2] *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. 601; *Maier*, 1 Br. Kor. p. 333 f; *Neander*, Br. Kor., p. 237 f., 240; *Olshausen*, Bibl. Comm., iii. p. 732 f.; *de Wette*, Br. Kor., p. 138.

from Galilee and other parts were in the Holy City, or that it occurred in Galilee itself, where they suppose believers to have been more numerous.[1] This is the merest conjecture; and there is not even ground for asserting that there were so many as 500 brethren in any one place, by whom Jesus could have been seen. The appearance to James is not mentioned in any of our Gospels. Jerome preserves a legend from the Gospel of the Hebrews, which states that James, after having drunk the cup of the Lord, swore that he would not eat bread until he should see him risen from the dead. When Jesus rose, therefore, he appeared to James; and, ordering a table and bread to be brought, blessed and broke the bread, and gave it to James.[2] Beyond this legendary story there is no other record of the report given by Paul. The occasion on which he was seen by "all the Apostles" is indefinite, and cannot be identified with any account in the Gospels.

It is asserted, however, that although Paul does not state from whom he "received" the report of these appearances of the risen Jesus, he must have heard them from the Apostles themselves. At any rate, it is added, Paul professes that his preaching on the death, burial, and Resurrection is the same as that of the other Apostles.[3] That the other Apostles preached the resurrection of Jesus may be a fact, but we have no information as to the precise statements they made. We shall presently discuss the doctrine from this point of view, but here we must confine ourselves to Paul. It is undeniable that Paul

[1] Probably in Jerusalem: *Bisping*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 265; *Alford*, Gk. Test., ii. p. 603; *Neander*, Br. Kor., p. 240 f. Probably in Galilee: *Maier*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 337. Uncertain: *Meyer*, 1 Br. Kor., p. 416; *Stanley*, Eps. to Cor., p. 288.

[2] *Hieron.* De vir. ill. ii.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 11, 12.

neither enters into details nor cites authority for the particular appearances which he mentions. As for the inference that, associating with the Apostles, he must have been informed by them of the appearances of Jesus, we may say that this by no means follows so clearly as is supposed. Paul was singularly independent, and at every turn we perceive in his writings that he disclaims all indebtedness to the elder Apostles. He claims that his Gospel is not after man, nor was it taught to him by man, but through revelation of Jesus Christ.[1] Now Paul himself informs us of his action after it pleased God to reveal his Son in him that he might preach him among the Gentiles. It might then, indeed, have been reasonably expected that Paul should have sought out those who could have informed him of all the extraordinary occurrences supposed to have taken place after the death of Jesus. Paul does nothing of the kind. He is apparently quite satisfied with his own convictions. "Immediately," he says, in his wondrously human and characteristic letter to the Galatians, "I communicated not with flesh and blood; neither went I away to Jerusalem to them who were Apostles before me, but I went away to Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, and abode with him fifteen days; but other of the Apostles saw I none, save James the brother of the Lord. Now the things which I write, behold before God I lie not. . . . Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem,"[2]—upon which occasion, we know, his business was not of a nature to allow us to suppose he obtained much information regarding the Resurrection. Now we may ask: Is there that thirst for information

[1] Gal. i. 11, 12.

[2] Gal. i. 16, 18, ii. 1.

regarding the facts and doctrines of Christianity displayed here, which entitles us to suppose that Paul eagerly and minutely investigated the evidence for them? We think not. Paul made up his own mind in his own way and, having waited three years without asking a question, it is not probable that the questions which he then asked were of any searching nature. The protest that he saw none of the other Apostles may prove his independence, but it certainly does not prove his anxiety for information. When Paul went up to make the acquaintance of Cephas his object was clearly not to be taught by him, but to place himself in communication with the man whom he believed to be the chief of the Apostles and, we may assume, largely with a view to establish a friendly feeling, and secure his recognition of his future ministry. We should not, of course, be justified in affirming that the conversation between the two great Apostles never turned upon the subject of the Resurrection, but we think that it is obvious that Paul's visit was not in the least one of investigation. He believed; he believed that certain events had occurred "according to the Scriptures;" and the legitimate inference from Paul's own statements must be that, in this visit after three years, his purpose was in no way connected with a search for evidential information. The Author of Acts, it will be remembered, represents him as, before any visit to Jerusalem, publicly and boldly preaching in Damascus that Jesus is the Son of God, and "confounding the Jews . . . . proving that this is the Christ."[1] This representation, it will be admitted, shows an advanced condition of belief little supporting the idea of subsequent investigation. When all conjectures are exhausted, however, we have the one distinct fact

[1] Acts ix. 20, 22, 27.

remaining, that Paul gives no authority for his report that Jesus was seen by the various persons mentioned, nor does he furnish any means by which we can judge of the nature and reality of the alleged phenomena. We continue here to speak of the appearances to others, reserving the appearance to himself, as standing upon a different basis, for separate examination.

Now what is the value of this evidence? The fact to be proved is that, after a man had been crucified, dead, and buried, he actually rose from the dead, and appeared alive to many persons. The evidence is that Paul, writing some twenty years after the supposed miraculous occurrences, states, without detailed information of any kind, and without pretending to have himself been an eye-witness of the phenomena, that he has been told that Jesus was, after his death and burial, seen alive on the occasions mentioned! Now, as to the Apostle Paul himself, let it be said in the strongest and most emphatic manner possible that we do not suggest the most distant suspicion of the sincerity of any historical statement he makes. We implicitly accept the historical statements, as distinguished from inferences, which proceed from his pen. It cannot be doubted that Paul was told that such appearances had taken place. We do not question the fact that he believed them to have taken place; and we shall hereafter discuss the weight to be attached to this circumstance. Does this, however, guarantee the truth of the reports or inferences of those who informed the Apostle? Does the mere passage of any story or tradition through Paul necessarily transmute error into truth —self-deception or hallucination into objective fact? Are we—without any information as to what was really stated to Paul, as to the personality and character of his infor-

mants, as to the details of what was believed to have occurred, as to the means taken or which it might have been possible to take to test the reality of the alleged phenomena, without an opportunity of judging for ourselves on a single point—to believe in the reality of these appearances simply because Paul states that he has been informed that they occurred, and himself believes the report? So far as the belief of Paul is concerned, we may here remark that his views as to the miraculous Charismata in the Church do not prepare us to feel any confidence in the sobriety of his judgment in connection with alleged supernatural occurrences. We have no reliance upon his instinctive mistrust of such statements, or his imperative requirement of evidence, but every reason to doubt them. On the other hand, without in any way imputing wilful incorrectness or untruth to the reporters of such phenomena, let it be remembered how important a part inference has to play in the narrative of every incident, and how easy it is to draw erroneous inferences from bare facts.[1] In proportion as persons are ignorant, on the one hand, and have their minds disturbed, on the other, by religious depression or excitement, hope, fear, or any other powerful emotion, they are liable to confound facts and inferences, and both to see and analyse wrongly. In the case of a supposed appearance

[1] We may merely in passing refer to the case of Mary Magdalene in the fourth Gospel. She sees a figure standing beside her, and infers that it is the gardener:—presently something else occurs which leads her to infer that she was mistaken in her first inference, and to infer next, that it is Jesus. It is a mere narrative upon which no serious argument can be based, but had she at first turned away, her first inference would have remained, and, according to the narrative, have been erroneous. We might also argue that, if further examination had taken place, her second inference might have proved as erroneous as the first is declared to have been.

alive of a person believed to be dead, it will scarcely be disputed, there are many disturbing elements, especially when that person has just died by a cruel and shameful death, and is believed to be the Messiah. The occurrence which we at any time see is, strictly speaking, merely a series of appearances, and the actual nature of the thing seen is determined in our minds by inferences. How often are these inferences correct? We venture to say that the greater part of the proverbial incorrectness and inaccuracy which prevails arises from the circumstance that inferences are not distinguished from facts, and are constantly erroneous. Now in that age, under such circumstances, and with Oriental temperaments, it is absolutely certain that there was exceptional liability to error, and because Paul repeats the statements of unknown persons, dependent so materially upon inference, that cannot possibly warrant us in believing them when they contradict known laws which express the results of universal experience. It is infinitely more probable that these persons were mistaken, than that a dead man returned to life again, and appeared to them. We shall presently consider how much importance is to be attached to the mere belief in the occurrence of such phenomena, but with regard to the appearances referred to by Paul, except in so far as they attest the fact that certain persons may have believed that Jesus appeared to them, such evidence has not the slightest value, and is indeed almost ludicrously insufficient to establish the reality of so stupendous a miracle as the Resurrection. It will have been observed that of the Ascension there is not a word—obviously for Paul the Resurrection and Ascension were one act.

Having so far discussed Paul's report that Jesus rose

from the dead and was seen by others, we turn to his statement that, last of all, he was seen also by himself. In the former cases, we have had to complain of the total absence of detailed information as to the circumstances under which he was supposed to have been seen; but it may be expected that at least in his own case we shall have full and minute particulars of so interesting and extraordinary a phenomenon. Here again we are disappointed. Paul does not give us a single detail. He neither tells us when, where, nor how he saw Jesus. It was all the more important that he should have entered into the particulars of this apparition, because there is one peculiarity in his case which requires notice. Whereas it may be supposed that in the other instances Jesus is represented as being seen immediately after the Resurrection and before his Ascension, the appearance to Paul must be placed years after that occurrence is alleged to have taken place. The question, therefore, arises: Was the appearance to Paul of the same character as the former? Paul very evidently considers that it was. He uses the very same word when he says "he was seen (ὤφθη) by me," that he employs in stating that "he was seen (ὤφθη) by Cephas" and the rest, and he classes all the appearances together in precisely the same way. If, therefore, Paul knew anything of the nature of the appearances to the others, and yet considers them to have been of the same nature as his own, an accurate account of his own vision might have enabled us in some degree to estimate that of the others. Even without this account, it is something to know that Paul believed that there was no difference between the earlier and later appearances. And yet, if we reflect that in the appearances immediately after the Resurrection the representa-

tion is that Jesus possessed the very same body that had hung on the cross and been laid in the sepulchre, and that, according to the Gospels, he exhibited his wounds, allowed them to be touched, assured the disciples of his corporeality by permitting himself to be handled, and even by eating food in their presence, and that in the case of Paul the appearance took place years after Jesus is said to have ascended into heaven and sat down at the right hand of God, the identity of the apparitions becomes a suggestive feature. The testimony of Paul must at least override that of the Gospels, and whatever may have been the vision of Paul, we may fairly assume that the vision of Peter and the rest was like it. Beyond this inference, however, Paul gives us no light with regard to the appearance of Jesus to himself. He merely affirms that Jesus did appear to him. "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" he says in one place.[1] Elsewhere he relates: "But when he was pleased, who set me apart from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles; immediately, I communicated not with flesh and blood . . . . but I went away into Arabia and returned again unto Damascus."[2] Various opinions have been expressed regarding the rendering of *ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί*. The great majority of critics agree that the direct and natural sense must be adopted: "to reveal his son in me," that is to say, "within me," "in my spirit."[3] Others maintain that *ἐν ἐμοί* must be ren-

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 1.

[2] Gal. i. 15. *ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ* 16. *ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εὐθέως οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι,* 17. . . . *ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβίαν, καὶ πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν.*

[3] So Alford, Bisping, Ellicott, Ewald, Holtzmann, Jowett, Meyer

dered "through me,"[1] giving ἐν the sense of διά; but in that case the following context would be quite unnecessary. Hilgenfeld[2] thinks that the meaning is "in his person;" and Rückert[3] and a few others read "to me." The liberties taken by interpreters of the New Testament with the proposition ἐν, too frequently from preconceived dogmatic reasons, are remarkable. The importance of this passage chiefly lies in the question whether the revelation here referred to is the same as the appearance to him of Jesus of the Corinthian letter. Some critics incline to the view that it is so,[4] whilst others consider that Paul does not thus speak of his vision, but rather of the doctrine concerning Jesus which formed his Gospel, and which Paul claimed to have received, not from man, but by revelation from God.[5] Upon this point we have only a few remarks to make. If it be understood that Paul refers to the appearance to him of Jesus, it is clear that he represents it in these words as a subjective vision, within his own consciousness. If, on the other hand, he do not refer to the appearance, then the passage loses all distinct reference to that occurrence. We do not intend to lay any further stress upon the expression than this, and it is fair to add that we do not think there

Olshausen, Schrader, Usteri, de Wette, Wieseler, Winer, Wordsworth, ad l.; *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 75 ff.; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w., p. 42 f., anm.; *Meijboom*, Jezus' Opstand., p. 105; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 117.

[1] *Grotius*, Annot. in N. T., vi. p. 553; *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Br. an die Gal., p. 26; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 82.

[2] Der Galaterbr., p. 121 [3] Ad l.

[4] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 75 ff.; *Meijboom*, Jezus' Opstand., p. 105 f.; *Jowett*, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 216 f., 230 f.; *Ewald*, *Holtzmann*, *Schrader*, *Usteri*, *Wieseler*, &c., in l.

[5] *Holsten*, Zum. Ev. Paul. u. s. w., p. 42, anm.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 117; *Alford*, *Bisping*, *Hilgenfeld*, *Lightfoot*, *Meyer*, *de Wette*, *Wordsworth*, &c., in l.

is any special reference to the apparition of Jesus in the passage, but simply an allusion to his conversion to Christianity, which the Apostle considered a revelation in his mind of the true character and work of the Christ which had previously been so completely misunderstood by him. We may as well say at once that we desire to take the argument in its broadest form, without wasting time by showing that Paul himself uses language which seems to indicate that he recognised the appearance of Jesus to have been merely subjective. The only other passage which we need now mention is the account which Paul gives, 2 Cor. xii. 2 ff., of his being caught up to the third heaven. A few critics consider that this may be the occasion on which Jesus appeared to him, to which he refers in the passage of the former letter which we are considering,[1] but the great majority are opposed to the supposition. In any case there is no evidence that the occasions are identical, and we therefore are not entitled to assume that they are so.

It will have been observed that we have hitherto confined our attention wholly to the undoubted writings of Paul. Were there no other reason than the simple fact that we are examining the evidence of Paul himself, and have, therefore, to do with that evidence alone, we should be thoroughly justified in this course. It is difficult to clear the mind of statements regarding Paul and his conversion which are made in the Acts of the Apostles, but it is absolutely essential that we should understand clearly what Paul himself tells us and what he does not, for the present totally excluding Acts. What then does Paul himself tell us

[1] Dr. Jowett thinks this not improbable. The Epistles of St. Paul, i. p. 229.

of the circumstances under which he saw Jesus? Absolutely nothing. The whole of his evidence for the Resurrection consists in the bare statement that he did see Jesus. Now can the fact that any man merely affirms, without even stating the circumstances, that a person once dead and buried has risen from the dead and been seen by him, be seriously considered satisfactory evidence for so astounding a miracle? Is it possible for any one of sober mind, acquainted with the nature of the proposition, on the one hand, and with the innumerable possibilities of error, on the other, to regard such an affirmation even as evidence of much importance in such a matter? We venture to say that, in such a case, an affirmation of this nature, even made by a man of high character and ability, would possess little weight. If the person making it, although of the highest honour, were known to suppose himself the subject of constant revelations and visions, and if, perhaps, he had a constitutional tendency to nervous excitement and ecstatic trance, his evidence would have no weight at all. We shall presently have to speak of this more in detail in connection with Paul. Such an allegation even supported by the fullest information and most circumstantial statement could not establish the reality of the miracle; without them, it has no claim to belief. What is the value of a person's testimony who simply makes an affirmation of some important matter, unaccompanied by particulars, and the truth of which cannot be subjected to the test of even the slightest cross-examination? It is worth nothing. It would not be received at all in a Court of Justice. If we knew the whole of the circumstances of the apparition to Paul, from which he inferred that he had seen the risen Jesus, the

natural explanation of the supposed miracle might be easy. There were no other witnesses of it. This is clear; for, had there been, Paul must have mentioned them as he mentioned the five hundred. We have only the report of a man who states that he had seen Jesus, unconfirmed by any witnesses. Under no circumstances could isolated evidence like this be of much value. Facts and inferences are alike uncorroborated, but on the other hand are contradicted by universal experience. When we analyse the evidence, it is reduced to this: Paul believed that he had seen Jesus. This belief constitutes the whole evidence of Paul himself for the Resurrection. It is usual to argue that the powerful effect which this belief produced upon Paul's life and teaching renders this belief of extraordinary force as evidence. This we are not prepared to admit. If the assertion that Jesus appeared to him had not been believed by Paul, it would not have secured a moment's attention. That this belief affected his life was the inevitable consequence of such belief. Paul eminently combined works with faith in his own life. When he believed Jesus to be an imposter, he did not content himself with sneering at human credulity, but vigorously persecuted his followers. When he came to believe Jesus to be the Messiah, he was not more inactive, but became the irrepressible Apostle of the Gentiles. He acted upon his convictions in both cases; but his mere persecution of Christianity no more proved Jesus to be an impostor than his mere preaching of Christianity proved Jesus to be the Messiah. It only proved that he believed so. He was as earnest in the one case as in the other. We repeat, therefore, that the evidence of Paul for the Resurrection amounts to

nothing more than the unfeigned belief that Jesus had been seen by him. We shall presently further examine the value of this belief as evidence for so astounding a miracle.

We must not form exaggerated conceptions of the effect upon Paul of the appearance to him of Jesus. That his convictions and views of Christianity were based upon the reality of the Resurrection is undeniable, and that they received powerful confirmation and impulse through his vision of Jesus is also not to be doubted, but let us clear our minds of representations derived from other sources and clearly understand what Paul himself does and does not say of this vision, and for this purpose we must confine ourselves to the undoubted writings of the Apostle. Does Paul himself ascribe his conversion to Christianity to the fact of his having seen Jesus? Most certainly not. That is a notion derived solely from the statements in Acts. The sudden and miraculous conversion of Paul is a product of the same pen which produced the story of the sudden conversion of the thief on the cross, an episode equally unknown to other writers. Paul neither says when nor where he saw Jesus. The revelation of God's Son in him not being an allusion to this vision of Jesus, but merely a reference to the light which dawned upon Paul's mind as to the character and mission of Jesus, there is no ground whatever, from the writings of the Apostle himself, to connect the appearance of Jesus with the conversion of Paul. The statement in the Epistle to the Galatians simply amounts to this: When it pleased him who elected him from his mother's womb, and called him by his grace, to reveal to his mind the truth concerning his Son, that he might preach

him among the Gentiles, he communicated not with flesh and blood, neither did he go up to Jerusalem to those who were Apostles before him, but immediately went away to Arabia, and after that returned again to Damascus. It can scarcely be doubted that Paul here refers to his change of views—to his conversion—but as little can it be doubted that he does not ascribe that conversion to the appearance to him of Jesus spoken of in the Corinthian letter. Let any reader who honestly desires to ascertain the exact position of the case ask himself the simple question whether, supposing the Acts of the Apostles never to have existed, it is possible to deduce from this, or any other statement of Paul, that he actually ascribes his conversion to the fact that Jesus appeared to him in a supernatural manner. He may possibly in some degree base his apostolic claims upon that appearance, although it may be doubted how far he does even this; if he did so, it would only prove the reality of his belief, but not the reality of the vision; but there is no evidence whatever in the writings of Paul that he connected his conversion with the appearance of Jesus. All that we can legitimately infer seems to be that, before his adoption of Christianity, he had persecuted the Church;[1] and further it may be gathered from the passage in the Galatian letter, that at the time when this change occurred he was at Damascus. At least he says that from Arabia he "returned again to Damascus," which seems to imply that he first went from that city to Arabia. When we consider the expressions in the two letters, it becomes apparent that Paul does not set forth any instantaneous conversion of the

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 9.

character related elsewhere. To the Galatians he describes his election from his mother's womb and call by the grace of God as antecedent to the revelation of his Son in him: "When he who separated me from my mother's womb and called me by his grace was pleased to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles," &c. And if the reading "through me" be adopted, the sense we are pointing out becomes still more apparent. In the Corinthian letter again, the expressions should be remarked: v. 8. "And last of all he was seen by me also, as the one born out of due time. 9. For I am the least of the apostles, that am not fit to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God: 10. but by the grace of God I am what I am: and his grace which was (bestowed) upon me was not in vain, but I laboured more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God with me. 11. Whether, therefore, it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed."[1] Peter sees Jesus first, Paul sees him last; and as the thought uppermost in his mind in writing this epistle was the parties in the Corinthian Church, and the opposition to himself and denial even of his apostleship, the mention of his having seen Jesus immediately leads him to speak of his apostolic claims. "Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" he had just before exclaimed, and proceeded to defend himself against his opponents: here again he reverts to the same

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 8. *ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὤφθη κἀμοί.* 9. *ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὃς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος, διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ·* 10. *χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμὶ ὅ εἰμι, καὶ ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἡ εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ κενὴ ἐγενήθη, ἀλλὰ περισσότερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἐκοπίασα, οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ ἀλλὰ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σὺν ἐμοί.* κ. τ. λ.

subject, with proud humility calling himself, on the one hand, "the least of the Apostles" but, on the other, asserting that he had "laboured more than they all." He is led to contrast his past life with his present; the time when he persecuted the Church with that in which he built it up. There is, however, no allusion to any miraculous conversion when he says: "by the grace of God I am what I am." He may consider his having seen the Lord and become a witness of his resurrection one part of his qualification for the Apostolate, but assuredly he does not represent this as the means of his conversion. We shall not pause to discuss at length how far being a witness for the resurrection really was made a necessary qualification for the apostolic office. The passages, Luke xxiv. 48, Acts i. 22, ii. 32, upon which the theory mainly rests, are not evidence of the fact which can for a moment be accepted. It is obvious that the Twelve were apostles from having been disciples of the Master from the commencement of his active career, and not from any fortuitous circumstance at its close. If Paul says: "Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" he continues: "Are ye not my work in the Lord? If I am not an apostle unto others, yet I am at least to you: for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord. My defence to them that examine me is this."[1] There can be no doubt that the claims of Paul to the Apostolate were, during his life, constantly denied, and his authority rejected. As we have elsewhere pointed out, there is no evidence that his apostleship was ever recognised by the elder Apostles, nor that his claim was ever submitted to them. Even in the

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 1—3.

second century, the Clementine Homilies deny him the honour, and make light of his visions and revelations. All the evidence we possess shows that Paul's vision of Jesus did not secure for him much consideration in his own time, a circumstance which certainly does not tend to establish its reality.

What weight can we, then, attach to the representation in the Acts of the Apostles of the conversion of Paul? Our examination of that work has sufficiently shown that none of its statements can be received as historical. Where we have been able to compare them with the epistles of Paul, they have not been in agreement. Nothing could be more obvious than the contradiction between the narrative of Paul's conduct after his conversion, according to Acts, and the account which Paul gives in the Galatian letter. We need not repeat the demonstration here. Where we possess the means of comparison, we discover the inaccuracy of Acts. Why should we suppose that which we cannot compare more accurate? So far as our argument is concerned, it matters very little whether we exclude the narrative of the conversion of Acts or not. We point out, however, that there is no confirmation whatever in the writings of Paul of the representation of his conversion by means of a vision of Jesus, which, upon all considerations, may much more reasonably be assigned to a somewhat later period. If we ventured to conjecture, we should say that the Author of Acts has expanded the scattered sayings of Paul into this narrative, making the miraculous conversion by a personal interposition of Jesus, which he therefore relates no less than three times, counterbalance the disadvantage of his not having followed Jesus in the

flesh.[1] It is curious that he has introduced the bare statement into the third Synoptic, that Jesus "was seen by Simon" (*ὤφθη Σίμωνι*),[2] which none of the other evangelists mentions, but which he may have found, without further particulars, *ὤφθη Κηφᾷ*, in the Epistle whence he derived, perhaps, materials for the other story. In no case can the narrative in Acts be received as evidence of the slightest value; but in order not to pass over even such statements in silence, we shall very briefly examine it.

The narrative is repeated thrice: in the first instance (ix. 1 ff.) as a historical account of the transaction; next (xxii. 4 ff.) introduced into a speech supposed to be delivered by Paul to the Jews when taken prisoner in consequence of their uproar on finding him in the Temple purifying himself with the four men who had a vow,—a position which cannot historically be reconciled with the character and views of Paul; and, thirdly, again put into the mouth of the Apostle (xxvi. 9 ff.) when he pleads his cause before King Agrippa. Paul is represented in the headlong career of persecuting the Church, and going with letters from the high priest empowering him to bring Christian men and women bound unto Jerusalem. "And as he journeyed, it came to pass that he drew nigh to Damascus, and suddenly there shone round about him a light out of the heaven, and he fell upon the earth and heard a voice saying unto him: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But rise and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do."[3] In the second account, there is so far

[1] Cf. *Schneckenburger*, Zweck der Apostelgesch., p. 61 f.

[2] Luke xxiv. 34.

[3] Acts ix. 3. *ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐγγίζειν τῇ Δαμασκῷ, ἐξαίφνης*

no very wide discrepancy, but there, as in the third, the time is said to be about noon. There is a very considerable difference in the third account, however, more especially in the report of what is said by the voice: xxvi. 13. "At midday, O King, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me and those journeying with me; 14. And when we all fell to the earth, I heard a voice saying unto me in the Hebrew tongue: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? it is hard for thee to kick against pricks. 15. And I said: Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said: I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. 16. But rise and stand upon thy feet; for I was seen by thee for this purpose, to choose thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou sawest, and of the things in which I will appear unto thee; 17. delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles, unto whom I send thee; 18. to open their eyes, that they may turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and a lot among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me."[1] It will be admitted

τε αὐτὸν περιήστραψεν φῶς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· 4. καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἤκουσεν φωνὴν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ· Σαοὺλ Σαούλ, τί με διώκεις; 5. εἶπεν δέ· Τίς εἶ, κύριε; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς, ὃν σὺ διώκεις. 6. ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι καὶ εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ λαληθήσεταί σοι ὅ τι σε δεῖ ποιεῖν. Cf. xxii. 6-8, 10.

[1] Acts xxvi. 13. ἡμέρας μέσης κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἶδον, βασιλεῦ, οὐρανόθεν ὑπὲρ τὴν λαμπρότητα τοῦ ἡλίου περιλάμψαν με φῶς καὶ τοὺς σὺν ἐμοὶ πορευομένους· 14. πάντων τε καταπεσόντων ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἤκουσα φωνὴν λέγουσαν πρός με τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ· Σαοὺλ, Σαούλ, τί με διώκεις; σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. 15. ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα· Τίς εἶ, κύριε; ὁ δὲ κύριος εἶπεν· Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς, ὃν σὺ διώκεις. 16. ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι καὶ στῆθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὤφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδες ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι, 17. ἐξαιρούμενός σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν, εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε, 18. ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κλῆρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ.

that this address is widely different from that reported in the two earlier accounts. Apologists argue that, in this third narrative, Paul has simply transferred from Ananias to Jesus the message delivered to him by the former, according to the second account. Let us first see what Ananias is there represented as saying. Acts xxii. 14: "And he said: The God of our fathers chose thee, to know his will and to see the Righteous One;[1] 15. for thou shalt be a witness to him unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard."[2] Now Paul clearly professes in the speech which he is represented as delivering before Agrippa to state what the voice said to him: "And he said," "and I said," "and he said," distinctly convey the meaning that the report is to be what actually was said. If the sense of what Ananias said to him is embodied in part of the address ascribed to the voice, it is strangely altered and put into the first person; but, beyond this, there is much added which neither appears in the speech of Ananias nor anywhere else in any of the narratives. If we further compare the instructions given to Ananias in the vision of the first narrative with his words in the second and those ascribed to the voice in the third, we shall see that these again differ very materially. Acts ix. 15. "But the Lord said unto him: Go; for this man is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before Gentiles and kings, and the sons of Israel; 16. For I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake."[3]

[1] It will be remembered that this epithet occurs in Acts iii. 14, vii. 52, and nowhere else in the New Testament.

[2] Acts xxii. 14. *ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· Ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν προεχειρίσατό σε γνῶναι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδεῖν τὸν δίκαιον καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ,* 15. *ὅτι ἔσῃ μάρτυς αὐτῷ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὧν ἑώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας.*

[3] Acts ix. 15. *εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος· Πορεύου, ὅτι σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς ἐστίν*

What must we think of a writer who deals so freely with his materials, and takes such liberties even with so serious a matter as this heavenly vision and the words of the glorified Jesus? In the third account, Jesus is represented as saying: "It is hard for thee to kick against pricks."[1] This is a well-known proverbial saying, frequently used by classical Greek and Latin authors,[2] and not altogether strange to Hebrew. It is a singularly anthropomorphic representation to put such a saying into the mouth of the divine apparition, and it assists in betraying the mundane origin of the whole scene. Another point deserving consideration is, that Paul is not told what he is to do by the voice of Jesus, but is desired to go into the city to be there instructed by Ananias. This is clearly opposed to Paul's own repeated asseverations. "For neither did I receive it from man nor was taught it, but through a revelation of Jesus Christ,"[3] is his statement. The details of the incident itself, moreover, are differently stated in the various accounts and cannot be reconciled. According to the first account, the companions of Paul "stood speechless" (ix. 7); in the third, they "all fell to the earth" (xxvi. 14). The explanation, that they first fell to the ground and then rose up, fails satisfactorily to harmonise the two statements; as does

μοι οὗτος τοῦ βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐνώπιον ἐθνῶν τε καὶ βασιλέων υἱῶν τε Ἰσραήλ· 16. ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑποδείξω αὐτῷ ὅσα δεῖ αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου παθεῖν.

[1] xxvi. 14. This phrase was introduced into Acts ix. 5 of the authorized version by Erasmus from the Vulgate, but it is not found there in any Greek MS. of the slightest authority.

[2] Cf. *Æsch.*, Prom., 323; Agamem., 1633; *Eurip.*, Bacch. 791; *Pindar.*, Pyth., ii. 173; *Terent.*, Phorm., i. 2. 27; *Plaut.*, Truc., iv. 2. 59. *Baumgarten, Beelen, Grotius, Hackett, Humphrey, Kuinoel, Meyer, Olshausen, Overbeck, Wetstein, de Wette, Wordsworth*, &c., in l. *Zeller*, Apg., p. 193, anm. 1.

[3] Gal. i. 11 ff.

likewise the suggestion that the first expression is simply an idiomatic mode of saying that they were speechless, independent of position. Then again, in the first account, it is said that the men stood speechless, "hearing the voice (*ἀκούοντες τῆς φωνῆς*) but seeing no one."[1] In the second we are told: "And they that were with me saw indeed the light; but they heard not the voice (*τὴν φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν*) of him speaking to me."[2] No two statements could be more contradictory. The attempt to reconcile them by explaining the verb *ἀκούω* in the one place "to hear" and in the other "to understand" is inadmissible, because wholly arbitrary. It is quite obvious that the word is used in the same sense in both passages, the difference being effected by the negative. In the third account, the voice is described as speaking "in the Hebrew tongue,"[3] which was probably the native tongue of the companions of Paul from Jerusalem. If they heard the voice speaking Hebrew, they must have understood it. The effort to make the vision clearly objective, and at the same time, to confine it to Paul, leads to these complications. The voice is heard, though the speaker is not seen, by the men, in the one story, whilst the light is seen, and the voice not heard, in the other, and yet it speaks in Hebrew according to the third, and even makes use of classical proverbs, and uses language wondrously similar to that of the Author of Acts. We may remark here that Paul's Gospel was certainly not revealed to him upon this occasion; and, therefore, the expressions in his epistles upon this subject must be referred to other revelations. There is, however, another curious point to be observed. Paul is not

[1] Acts ix. 7. [2] Acts xxii. 9. [3] Acts xxvi. 14.

described as having actually seen Jesus in the vision. According to the first two accounts, a light shines round about him and he falls to the ground and hears a voice; when he rises he is blind.[1] If in the third account he sees the light from heaven above the brightness of the sun shining round about him and his companions,[2] they equally see it, according to the second account.[3] The blindness, therefore, is miraculous and symbolic, for the men are not blinded by the light.[4] It is singular that Paul nowhere refers to this blindness in his letters. It cannot be doubted that the writer's purpose is to symbolise the very change from darkness to light, in the case of Paul, which, after Old Testament prophecies, is referred to in the words ascribed, in the third account,[5] to the voice. Paul, thus, only sees the light which surrounds the glorified Jesus, but not his own person, and the identification proceeds only from the statement: "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." It is true that the expression is strangely put into the mouth of Jesus, in the third account: "for I was seen by thee (ὤφθην σοι) for this purpose," &c.,[6] but the narrative excludes the actual sight of the speaker, and it is scarcely possible to read the words just quoted, and their context, without being struck by their incongruity. We need not point out the sources of this representation of light shrouding the heavenly vision, so common in the Old Testament. Before proceeding to the rest of the account, we may point out in passing the similarity of the details of this scene to the vision of Daniel x. 7-9. Returning,

[1] Acts ix. 3, 4, 8, xxii. 6, 7, 11.
[2] xxvi. 13.
[3] xxii. 9.
[4] xxii. 11, does not refute this.
[5] xxvi. 18.
[6] xxvi. 16.

however, to the first narrative, we are told that, about the same time as this miracle was occurring to Paul, a supernatural communication was being made to Ananias in Damascus: ix. 10. "And to him said the Lord in a vision: Ananias. And he said, Behold I am here Lord. 11. And the Lord said unto him: Rise and go to the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul, of Tarsus; for, behold he prayeth; 12 and he saw a man named Ananias who came in and put his hand on him that he might receive sight. 13. But Ananias answered, Lord I heard from many concerning this man, how much evil he did to thy saints in Jerusalem: 14. And here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name. 15. But the Lord said, Go, &c. (quoted above). 17. And Ananias went away, and entered into the house; and having put his hands on him said: Brother Saul, the Lord hath sent me, even Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way by which thou camest, that thou mightest receive sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit. 18. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it were scales; and he received sight, rose up, and was baptized, and having taken food was strengthened." We have already had occasion to point out, in connection with the parallelism kept up in Acts between the Apostle of the Gentiles and the Apostle of the Circumcision, that a similar double vision is narrated by the Author as occurring to Peter and Cornelius. Some further vision is referred to in v. 12; for in no form of the narrative of Paul's vision on the way to Damascus is he represented as seeing a man named Ananias coming to him for the purpose described. Many questions are

suggested by the story just quoted. How did Ananias know that Paul had authority from the chief priests to arrest any one? How could he argue in such a way with the Lord? Did he not then know that Jesus had appeared to Paul on the way? How did he get that information? Is it not an extraordinary thing that Paul never mentions Ananias in any of his letters, nor in any way refers to these miracles? We have already referred to the symbolic nature of the blindness, and recovery of sight on receiving the Holy Spirit and being baptized, and this is rendered still more apparent by the statement: v. 9. "And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink." We may further point out that in immediate connection with this episode Paul is represented, in the second account, as stating that, on going to Jerusalem, he has another vision of Jesus: xxii. 17. "And it came to pass that, when I returned to Jerusalem and was praying in the Temple, I was in a trance, 18. and saw him saying unto me: Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem; for they will not receive thy witness concerning me. 19. And I said: Lord, they themselves know that I was wont to imprison and beat in every synagogue them that believe on thee. 20. And when the blood of Stephen, thy witness, was shed, I also was standing by and consenting, and keeping the garments of them that slew him. 21. And he said unto me: Go, for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles." It seems impossible, considering the utter silence of Paul, that the apparition to which he refers can have spoken to him at length as described upon these occasions.[1] We have elsewhere remarked

[1] *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, iii. 542 f.

that there is not the slightest evidence in his own or other writings connecting any Stephen with Paul, and it may be appropriate to add here that, supposing him to have been present when the martyr exclaimed: "Lo, I behold the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God," [1] it is singular that he does not name him as one of those by whom Jesus "was seen." To resume this discussion, however: we have already shown that the statements of the Acts regarding Paul's conduct after this alleged vision are distinctly in contradiction with the statements of Paul. The explanation here given of the cause of Paul's leaving Jerusalem, moreover, is not in agreement with the Acts ix. 29f., and much less with Gal. i. 20ff. The three narratives themselves are full of irreconcilable differences and incongruities, which destroy all reasonable confidence in any substantial basis for the story. It is evident that the three narratives are from the same pen, and betray the composition of the Author of Acts.[2] They cannot be regarded as true history.[3] The hand of the composer is very apparent in the lavish use of the miraculous, so characteristic of the whole work. It is worth while to catalogue the supernatural incidents of this episode. 1 The vision; 2 Companions hearing

[1] vii. 56.

[2] *Zeller*, Apg., p. 399 ff.; *Lekebusch*, Apg., p. 125 f., 129 f.; *Overbeck*, zu de Wette, Apg., p. 139; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 235.

[3] *Baur*, Paulus. i. p. 70 ff.; *Gfrörer*, Die heil. Sage, i. p. 412 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol. 1864, p. 155 ff.; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paul., u. s. w., p. 34 ff.; *Meijboom*, Jezus' Opstanding, p. 99 ff.; *Overbeck*, zu de W. Apg., p. 132 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 178 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 529 f.; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 17 ff.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 540 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 191 ff. Cf. *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 246 ff.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 345 ff.; *Hausrath*, Der Ap. Paulus, p. 125 ff.; in Schenkel's B. L., iv. p. 416 ff.; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 132 f.; *Schneckenburger*, Apg., p. 167 ff., 180 ff.

the voice but seeing no man, or not hearing the voice but seeing the light; 3 Paul's blindness; 4 Vision of Ananias; 5 Restoration of sight to Paul; 6 Trance of Paul in Jerusalem. Such a narrative cannot be received in evidence.

The testimony before us simply amounts to this: Paul believed that he had seen Jesus some years after his death: there is no evidence that he ever saw him during his life.[1] He states that he had "received" that he was seen by various other persons, but he does not give the slightest information as to who told him, or what reasons he had for believing the statements to be correct. And still less does he narrate the particulars of the alleged appearances or even of his own vision. Although we have no detailed statements of these extraordinary phenomena, we may assume that, as Paul himself believed that he had seen Jesus, certain other people of the circle of his disciples likewise believed that they had seen the risen Master. The whole of the evidence for the Resurrection reduces itself to an undefined belief on the part of a few persons, in a notoriously superstitious age, that after Jesus had died and been buried they had seen him alive. These visions, it is admitted, occurred at a time of the most intense religious excitement, and under circumstances of wholly exceptional mental agitation and distress. The wildest alternations of fear, doubt, hope and indefinite expectation, added their effects to oriental imaginations already excited by indignation at the

[1] *Ebrard*, Wiss. Kr. ev. Gesch., p. 719, anm. 13; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 70 f.; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1864, p. 184 f.; Einl., p. 219; *Pfleiderer*, Paulinismus, p. 304 anm.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 173, 210 ff.; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu, p. 276.

fate of their Master, and sorrow or despair at such a dissipation of their Messianic dreams. There was present every element of intellectual and moral disturbance. Now must we seriously ask again whether this bare and wholly unjustified belief can be accepted as satisfactory evidence for so astounding a miracle as the Resurrection? Can the belief of such men, in such an age, establish the reality of a phenomenon which is contradicted by universal experience? We have no evidence as to what actually occurred. We do not even know the facts upon which they based their inferences. We only know that they thought they had seen Jesus and that they therefore concluded that he had risen from the dead. It comes to us as bare belief from the Age of Miracles, unsupported by facts, uncorroborated by evidence, unaccompanied by proof of investigation, and unprovided with material for examination. What is such belief worth? We have no hesitation in saying that it is absolutely worth nothing.

We might here well bring our inquiry to a close, for we have no further evidence to deal with. The problem, however, is so full of interest that we cannot yet lay it down, and although we must restrain our argument within certain rigid limits, and wholly refrain from entering into regions of mere speculation, we may further discuss the origin and nature of the belief in the Resurrection. Recognizing the fact that, although its nature and extent are very indefinite, there existed an undoubted belief that, after his death, Jesus was seen alive; the argument is advanced that there must have been a real basis for this belief.

"The existence of a Christian society," says an apologetic writer, "is the first and (if rightly viewed) the final proof of the historic truth of the miracle on which it was founded. It may indeed be said that the Church was founded upon the belief in the Resurrection, and not upon the Resurrection itself: and that the testimony must therefore be limited to the attestation of the belief, and cannot reach to the attestation of the fact. But belief expressed in action is for the most part the strongest evidence which we can have of any historic event. Unless, therefore, it can be shown that the origin of the apostolic belief in the Resurrection, with due regard to the fulness of its characteristic form, and the breadth and rapidity of its propagation can be satisfactorily explained on other grounds, the belief itself is a sufficient proof of the fact."[1] This is obviously Paley's argument of the Twelve men[2] in a condensed form. Belief in action may be the strongest evidence which we can have of any historic event; but when the historic event happens to be an event in religious history, and an astounding miracle like the Resurrection, such bare evidence, emanating from such an age, is not very strong evidence, after all. The breadth and rapidity of its propagation absolutely prove nothing but belief in the report of those who believed; although it is very far from evident that people embraced Christianity from a rational belief in the Resurrection. No one pretends that the Gentiles who believed made a preliminary examination of the truth of the Resurrection. If breadth

[1] *Westcott*, The Gospel of the Resurrection, 3rd ed., p. 106 f.

[2] Evidences and Horæ Paulinæ, ed. Potts, 1850, p. 6.

and rapidity of propagation be taken as sufficient proof of the truth of facts, we might consider Buddhism and Mahomedanism as satisfactorily attested creeds. There could not be a greater fallacy than the supposition that the origin of a belief must be explained upon other grounds, or that belief itself accepted as a sufficient proof of the fact asserted. The truth or falsehood of any allegation is determined by a balance of evidence, and the critic is no more bound to account for the formation of erroneous belief than he is bound to believe because he may not, after a great lapse of time, be able so clearly to demonstrate the particular manner in which that erroneous belief originated, that any other mode is definitely excluded. The belief that a dead man rose from the dead and appeared to several persons alive is at once disposed of upon abstract grounds. The alleged occurrence is contrary to universal experience; but on the other hand the prevalence of defective observation, mistaken inference, self-deception and credulity, any of which might lead to such belief, are only too well-known to it. Is it necessary to define which peculiar form of error is present in every false belief, before, with this immense preponderance of evidence against it, we finally reject it? We think not. Any explanation consistent with universal experience must be adopted, rather than a belief which is contradictory to it.

There are two theories which have been advanced to explain the origin of the apostolic belief in the Resurrection, to which we may now briefly refer; but it must be clearly understood that the suggestion of an explanation is quite apart from our examination of the actual evidence for the Resurrection. Fifty ex-

planations might be offered and be considered unsatisfactory without in the least degree altering the fact, that the testimony for the final miracle of Christianity is totally insufficient, and that the allegation that it actually occurred cannot be maintained. The first explanation, adopted by some able critics, is that Jesus did not really die on the cross, but being taken down alive, and his body being delivered to friends, he subsequently revived. In support of this theory, it is argued that Jesus is represented by the Gospels as expiring after having been but three to six hours upon the cross, which would have been an unprecedentedly rapid death. It is affirmed that only the hands and not the feet were nailed to the cross. The crurifragium, not usually accompanying crucifixion, is dismissed as unknown to the three Synoptists, and only inserted by the fourth Evangelist for dogmatic reasons, and of course the lance-thrust disappears with the leg-breaking. Thus the apparent death was that profound faintness which might well fall upon such an organization after some hours of physical and mental agony on the cross, following the continued strain and fatigue of the previous night. As soon as he had sufficiently recovered, it is supposed that Jesus visited his disciples a few times to re-assure them, but with precaution on account of the Jews, and was by them believed to have risen from the dead, as indeed he himself may likewise have supposed, reviving as he had done from the faintness of death.[1]

[1] *Ufrörer*, who maintains the theory of a Scheintod with great ability, thinks that Jesus had believers amongst the rulers of the Jews, who, although they could not shield him from the opposition against him, still hoped to save him from death. Joseph, *a rich man*, found the means of

Seeing, however, that his death had set the crown upon his work, the Master withdrew into impenetrable obscurity and was heard of no more. We have given but the baldest outline of this theory; for it would occupy too much space to represent it adequately and show the ingenuity with which it is worked out, and the very considerable support which it receives from statements in the Gospels, and from inferences deducible from them. We do not ourselves adopt this explanation, although it must be clearly repeated that, were the only alternative to do so, or to fall back upon the hypothesis of a miracle, we should consider it preferable. A serious objection brought against the theory seems to be, that it is not natural to suppose that, after such intense and protracted fatigue and anxiety followed by the most cruel agony on the cross, agony both of soul and body,[1] ending in unconsciousness only short of death, Jesus could within a short period have presented himself to his disciples with such an aspect as could have conveyed to them the impression of

doing so. He prepared the new sepulchre close to the place of execution to be at hand—begged the body from Pilate—the immense quantity of spices bought by Nicodemus being merely to distract the attention of the Jews—and Jesus being quickly carried to the sepulchre, was restored to life by their efforts. He interprets the famous verse John xx. 17 curiously. The expression: "I have not yet ascended to my Father and your Father," &c., he takes as meaning simply the act of dying: "going to heaven," and the reply of Jesus is equivalent to: "Touch me not, for I am still flesh and blood—I am not yet dead." Jesus sees his disciples only a few times mysteriously, and believing that he had set the final seal to the truth of his work by his death, he then retires into impenetrable gloom. Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit, p. 107 ff., p. 231 ff.

[1] *Holsten* remarks that the cry put into the mouth of Jesus on the Cross, in the first and second Synoptics: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" if genuine, can scarcely be otherwise historically conceived than as a last surrender of his last hope that God's will would not continue his sufferings even unto death. Zum Ev. des Paulus u. Petr., p. 227.

victory over death by the Prince of Life. He must still, it is urged, have presented the fresh traces of suffering and weakness little calculated to inspire them with the idea of divine power and glory. This is partly, but not altogether, true. There is no evidence, as we shall presently show, that the appearances of Jesus occurred so soon as is generally represented; and, in their astonishment at again seeing the Master whom they supposed to be dead, the disciples could not have been in a state minutely to remark the signs of suffering,[1] then probably, with the power of a mind like that of Jesus over physical weakness, little apparent. Time and imagination would doubtless soon have effaced from their minds any such impressions, and left only the belief that he had risen from the dead to develope and form the Christian doctrine. A more powerful objection seems to us the disappearance of Jesus. We cannot easily persuade ourselves that such a teacher could have renounced his work and left no subsequent trace of his existence. Still, it must be admitted that many explanations might be offered on this head, the most obvious being that death, whether as the result of the terrible crisis through which he had passed, or from some other cause, may soon after have ensued. We repeat, however, that we neither advance this explanation nor think it worth while to discuss it seriously, not because we think it untenable, although we do not adopt it, but because we consider that there is another explanation of the origin of belief in the Resurrection which

[1] The repeated statement in the Gospels that the women and his disciples did not at first recognize the risen Jesus, are quoted in connection with this point.

is better, and which is in our opinion the true one. We mean that which is usually called the "vision-hypothesis."

The phenomenon which has to be accounted for is the apostolic belief that, after he had been dead and buried, Jesus "was seen" (ὤφθη) by certain persons. The explanation which we offer, and which has long been adopted in various forms by able critics,[1] is, that doubtless Jesus was seen, but the vision was not real and objective, but illusory and subjective; that is to say: Jesus was not himself seen, but only a representation of Jesus within the minds of the beholders. This explanation not only does not impeach the veracity of those who affirmed that they had seen Jesus, but, accepting to a certain extent a subjective truth at the basis of the belief, explains upon well-known and natural principles the erroneous inference deduced from the subjective vision. It seems to us that the points to be determined are simple and obvious: Is it possible for a man to mistake subjective impressions for objective occurrences? Is it possible that any considerable number of persons can at the same time receive similar subjective impressions and mistake them for objective facts? If these questions can be answered affirmatively,

[1] *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 68 ff.; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w., p. 117 ff., *et passim*; *Meijboom*, Jezus' Opstanding, p. 99 ff., 162 ff.; *Noack*, Die Auferstehn. d. Gekreuzigten im Lichte heut. Wiss., 1861, p. 133 ff.; Urspr. d. Christ., ii. p. 274 f.; *Renan*, Vie de Jésus, p. 448 ff.; Les Apôtres, p. 10 ff.; *Réville*, La Résurrection de J. C., p. 11 ff.; *Strauss*, Leb. Jesu, p. 295 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 196 ff. Cf. *Krüger-Velthusen*, Leb. Jesu, p. 263 ff.; *Scholten*, Het Ev. n. Joh., p. 346 ff.; *Volkmar*, Die Evangelien, p. 612 ff.; Die Rel. Jesu, p. 86 ff., 108; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., p. 254 ff.; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., p. 438.

and it can be shown that the circumstances, the characters, the constitution of those who believed in the first instance, favoured the reception of such subjective impressions, and equally the deduction of erroneous inferences; it may be admitted that a satisfactory explanation can thus be given of the apostolic belief, on other grounds than the reality of a miracle opposed to universal experience, little as we feel bound to give any such explanation at all. No sooner is the first question formulated than it becomes obvious to every one who is acquainted with psychological and physiological researches, or who has even the most elementary knowledge of the influence of the mind upon the body, that it must at once be answered in the affirmative. Indeed the affirmation that subjective impressions, in connection with every sense, can be mistaken for, and believed to be, actual objective effects, is so trite that it seems almost superfluous to make it. Every reader must be well acquainted with illustrations of the fact, or can readily make himself acquainted with them. The only difficulty is to deal authoritatively with such a point within moderate compass. We must limit ourselves to the sense of sight. "There are abundant proofs," says Sir Benjamin Brodie, "that impressions may be made in the brain by other causes simulating those which are made on it by external objects through the medium of the organs of sense, thus producing false perceptions, which may, in the first instance, and before we have had time to reflect on the subject, be mistaken for realities."[1] The limitation here introduced: "before we have had time to reflect on the subject," is of course valid in the

[1] Psychological Inquiries, 1854, p. 78; cf. 79 ff.

case of those whose reason is capable of rejecting the false perceptions, whether on the ground of natural law or of probability; but, in anyone ignorant of natural law, familiar with the idea of supernatural agency and the occurrence of miraculous events, it is obvious, reflection, if reflection of a sceptical kind can even be assumed, would have little chance of arriving at any true discrimination of phenomena. Speaking of the nervous system and its functions, and more immediately of the relation of the Cerebrum to the Sensorium and the production of spectral illusions, Dr. Carpenter says, in his work on the "Principles of Mental Physiology," which is well worth the study of those interested in the question we are discussing: "Still stronger evidence of the same associated action of the Cerebrum and Sensorium, is furnished by the study of the phenomena designated as *Spectral Illusions.* These are clearly *sensorial* states *not* excited by external objects; and it is also clear that they frequently originate in cerebral changes, since they represent *creations* of the mind, and are not mere reproductions of past sensations." Dr. Carpenter refers in illustration to a curious illusion to which Sir John Herschel was subject, "in the shape of the involuntary occurrence of Visual impressions, into which Geometrical regularity of form enters as the leading character. These were not of the nature of those occular Spectra which may be attributed with probability to retinal changes."[1] Dr. Carpenter then continues: "We have here *not* a reproduction of sensorial impressions formerly received; but a *construction* of *new* forms, by a process

[1] Sir John Herschel gives a full account of them in his "Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects," (Daldy, Isbester, & Co., 1876) p. 402 ff.

which, if it had been carried on *consciously*, we should have called imagination. And it is difficult to see how it is to be accounted for in any other way, than by an unconscious action of the cerebrum; the products of which impress themselves on the sensorial consciousness, just as, in other cases, they express themselves through the motor apparatus."[1] The illusions described by Sir John Herschel who, as he himself says, was "as little visionary as most people" should be referred to. Of the production of sensations by ideas there can be no possible doubt[2] and, consequently, as little of the realisation by the person in whom they are produced of subjective impressions exactly as though they were objective. With regard to false perceptions, Dr. Carpenter says: "It has been shown that the action of *ideational* states upon the Sensorium can modify or even produce *sensations*. But the action of pre-existing states of Mind is still more frequently shown in modifying the *interpretation* which we put upon our sense-impressions. For since almost every such interpretation is an act of *judgment* based upon experience, that judgment will vary according to our mental condition at the time it is delivered; and will be greatly affected by any dominant idea or feeling, so as even to occasion a complete mis-interpretation of the objective source of the sense-impression, as often occurs in what is termed 'absence of mind.' The following case, mentioned by Dr. Tuke[3] as occuring within his own knowledge, affords a good example of this fallacy:— 'A lady was walking one day from Penryn to Falmouth,

[1] Principles of Mental Physiology, 4th ed., 1876, p. 113 f.
[2] Ib., p. 155 ff. [3] Influence of the Mind on the Body, p. 44.

and her mind being at that time, or recently, occupied by the subject of drinking-fountains, thought she saw in the road a newly-erected fountain, and even distinguished an inscription upon it, namely—"*If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink.*" Some time afterwards, she mentioned the fact with pleasure to the daughters of a gentleman who was supposed to have erected it. They expressed their surprise at her statement, and assured her that she must be quite mistaken. Perplexed with the contradiction between the testimony of her senses and of those who would have been aware of the fact had it been true, and feeling that she could not have been deceived ("for seeing is believing"), she repaired to the spot, and found to her astonishment that no drinking-fountain was in existence—only a few scattered stones, which had formed the foundation upon which the suggestion of an expectant imagination had built the superstructure. The subject having previously occupied her attention, these sufficed to form, not only a definite erection, but one inscribed by an appropriate motto corresponding to the leading idea.'"[1] We may give as another illustration an illusion which presented itself to Sir Walter Scott.[2] He had been reading, shortly after the death of Lord Byron, an account in a publication professing to detail the habits and opinions of the poet. As Scott had been intimate with Lord Byron he was deeply interested in the publication, which contained some particulars relative to himself and other friends. "Their sitting-room opened into an entrance hall, rather fantastically fitted

[1] *Carpenter*, Ib., 206 f.

[2] It is likewise quoted by Dr. Carpenter, p. 207 f.

up with articles of armour, skins of wild animals, and the like. It was when laying down his book, and passing into this hall, through which the moon was beginning to shine, that the individual of whom I speak saw, right before him, and in a standing posture, the exact representation of his departed friend whose recollection had been so strongly brought to his imagination. He stopped for a single moment, so as to notice the wonderful accuracy with which fancy had impressed upon the bodily eye the peculiarities of dress and posture of the illustrious poet. Sensible, however, of the delusion, he felt no sentiment save that of wonder at the extraordinary accuracy of the resemblance, and stepped onward towards the figure, which resolved itself, as he approached, into the various materials of which it was composed. These were merely a screen, occupied by great-coats, shawls, plaids and such other articles as usually are found in a country entrance-hall. The spectator returned to the spot from which he had seen the illusion, and endeavoured, with all his power, to recall the image which had been so singularly vivid. But this was beyond his capacity," &c.[1] Although Sir Walter Scott might be sensible of the delusion, it may be more than doubted whether, in the first century of our era, such an apparition proceeding from or connected with religious agitation of mind would have been considered so. Dr. Abercrombie[2] mentions many instances of spectral illusions, "some of the most authentic facts" relating to which he classes under the head of "intense mental conceptions

[1] Demonology and Witchcraft, 1868, Letter i. p. 37 f.

[2] Inquiries concerning the Intellectual Powers, 19th ed., p. 274 ff.

so strongly impressed upon the mind as, for the moment, to be believed to have a real existence." We cannot, however, venture to quote illustrations.[1] Dr. Hibbert, in whose work on Apparitions many interesting instances are to be found, thus concludes his consideration of the conditions which lead to such illusions: "I have at length concluded my observations on what may be considered as the leading mental laws which are connected with the origin of spectral impressions. The general inference to be drawn from them is,—that *Apparitions are nothing more than morbid symptoms, which are indicative of an intense excitement of the renovated feelings of the mind.*"[2] Subjective visions, believed to have had objective reality, abound in the history of the world. They are familiar to all who have read the lives of the Saints, and they have accompanied the progress of Christianity in various forms from the trances of Montanism to the vision of the "Immaculate Conception" in the Grotto of Lourdes.

If we turn to the inquiry whether a similar subjective impression can be received by many persons at one time and be mistaken by them for an objective reality, an equally certain reply in the affirmative must unhesitatingly be given. The contagiousness of emotion is well known,[3] and the rapidity with which panic, for instance, spreads from a single individual to the mass is remarked

[1] Every one remembers the case of Luther and his visions of the Devil.

[2] Sketches of the Philosophy of Apparitions, by Samuel Hibbert, M.D., F.R.S.E., 2nd ed., 1825, p. 375.

[3] We might point in illustration to the use of "Tongues" in the Corinthian Church, where the contagiousness of the ecstatic state is exemplified. 1 Cor. xiv. 23, 26 ff.

every day. The most trifling incident, unseen by more than a few and, therefore, more pliant in the imagination of the many, has instantaneously convinced multitudes of the most erroneous inferences. We need scarcely refer, moreover, to the numerous religious and other mental epidemics which have swept over the face of the world, infecting society with the wildest delusions. From Montanism to camp meetings and revivals in our own day, it has been demonstrated that religious excitement and dominant ideas have spread with astonishing rapidity and power amongst the circles in which they have arisen. In certain states of nervous expectation, false impressions are instantaneously transmitted from one to another in a religious assembly. Dr. Carpenter says: "Moreover, if not only a single individual, but several persons should be 'possessed' by one and the same idea or feeling, the same misinterpretation may be made by all of them; and in such a case the concurrence of their testimony does not add the least strength to it.—Of this we have a good example in the following occurrence cited by Dr. Tuke, as showing the influence of a 'dominant idea' in falsifying the perceptions of a number of persons at once:—'During the conflagration at the Crystal Palace in the winter of 1866-67, when the animals were destroyed by the fire, it was supposed that the Chimpanzee had succeeded in escaping from his cage. Attracted to the roof, with this expectation in full force, men saw the unhappy animal holding on to it, and writhing in agony to get astride one of the iron ribs. It need not be said that its struggles were watched by those below with breathless suspense, and as the newspapers informed us 'with sickening dread.' But there was no animal whatever there; and all this feeling was thrown away upon a tattered piece of blind,

so torn as to resemble to the eye of fancy, the body, arms, and legs of an ape!' (Op. cit., p. 44.) Another example of a like influence affecting several individuals simultaneously in a similar manner is mentioned by Dr. Hibbert in his well-known Treatise on Apparitions:—'A whole ship's company was thrown into the utmost consternation by the apparition of a cook who had died a few days before. He was distinctly seen walking a-head of the ship, with a peculiar gait by which he was distinguished when alive, through having one of his legs shorter than the other. On steering the ship towards the object, it was found to be a piece of floating wreck.' Many similar cases might be referred to, in which the imagination has worked up into 'apparitions' some common-place objects, which it has invested with attributes derived from the previous Mental state of the observer; and the belief in such an apparition as a reality, which usually exists in such cases, unless antagonized by an effort of the reason, constitutes a *delusion*."[1] We must maintain indeed that a number of persons assembled under the influence of strong similar ideas, and excited by the same active religious emotion are more likely to be affected by similar subjective impressions to the extent of believing them to be objective than one or two would be. The excitement of each acts upon the whole body, and is itself increased by reaction from the aggregate emotion. Each receives impressions from the other, which are vividly felt even without being verified by personal experience. The most nervous temperament in the assembly gives the final impetus to the excited imagination of the rest. In moments of supreme expectation and doubt, enthusiasm overcomes reason. If one man see, if one man

[1] Principles of Mental Physiology, 1876, p. 208 f.

hear, the mental impression is credited with an objective cause, even when unfelt by others, and then a similar impression is soon carried from the brain to the sensorium of all. There is no supposition of a diseased mind in this in ordinary cases, and in the instances which we have in view the false perceptions were determined and encouraged by foregone conclusions of a nature rarely possible and, when existing, rarely resisted. "There are many persons," adds Dr. Carpenter, "quite sane upon ordinary matters, and even (it may be) distinguished by some special form of ability, who are yet affected with what the writer once heard Mr. Carlyle term a 'diluted insanity;' allowing their minds to become so completely 'possessed' by 'dominant ideas,' that their testimony as to what they declare themselves to have witnessed—even when several individuals concur in giving exactly the same account of it—must be regarded as utterly untrustworthy."[1]

That subjective impressions can, in the opinion of eminent apologists, be recorded by an Evangelist as objective reality, we have already pointed out in connection with the statement of the first Synoptist, that "Many bodies of the saints were raised; and they came out of the sepulchres after his resurrection and appeared unto many." (xxvii. 52 f.) Dean Milman and Canon Farrar explain this by the supposition that the earthquake "seemed to have filled the air with ghostly visitants, who after Christ had risen appeared to linger in the Holy City."[2] It follows as a logical consequence that as this subjective impression felt by many at once is

[1] Principles of Mental Physiology, 1876, p. 209.

[2] *Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 419; *Milman*, Hist. of Christianity, i. 336 f. Passages quoted p. 426.

described in the Gospel as objective; these writers not only admit the possibility of such a mistake on the part of the observers, but that the Gospel, in adopting that mistake, may be suspected of a similar course in recording the appearances of Jesus.

We have thus replied to the question whether the "vision hypothesis" could explain the belief of five hundred, or even of eleven persons who supposed they had seen Jesus at once, and we do not think that any one who seriously considers the Age, and the circumstances under which the phenomenon is alleged to have occurred, can doubt that such belief could very easily have resulted from merely subjective impressions. Before going further into the discussion of the matter, however, we must again, with a little more minuteness, call attention to the date of the actual statements upon which the whole argument turns. The Apostle Paul writes about a quarter of a century after the time when it is said that Jesus "was seen" by those whom he names. Whatever opinion may be formed as to the amount of information obtained by Paul during the visit he paid to Jerusalem for the purpose of making the acquaintance of Peter, it is undeniable that some years had elapsed between the time when Jesus is supposed to have been seen and the time when Paul could have received information regarding these appearances from any of the Apostles. If we date the death of Jesus in the year 33, almost the latest date assigned to it by any eminent critic, and the conversion of Paul about A.D. 38-40,[1] it will be remembered that the

[1] The Chronicon Paschale dates it 42; and the following critics date it as noted: *Michaelis*, about 37? *Kuinoel*, 40; *Heinrichs*, 37? *Eichhorn*, 37 or 38; *Hug*, 35; *Schmidt*, 41; *Bertholdt*, 40; *Feilmoser*, 35; *Winer*, 38? *de Wette*, 37 or 38; *Schott*, 37; *Schrader*, 39; *Anger*, 38? *Wieseler*, 40;

Apostle himself states that he did not go to Jerusalem till three years after, which brings us to A.D. 41-43 as the earliest time when Paul first came in personal contact with Peter and James. He did not go up to Jerusalem again for fourteen years after that, and we have no reason for believing that he met any of the Apostles in the interval, but the contrary, from his own account of that second visit, Gal. ii. 2. He could not, therefore, have heard anything of the appearances of Jesus even from Peter and James till some eight to ten years after they had taken place. From the other Apostles, in all probability, he cannot have heard anything till nearly twenty years had elapsed since they supposed they had seen Jesus. Where did he get his information regarding the 500 brethren at once? From whom did he get it? If the supposed appearance took place, as so many suppose, in Galilee, the date of his information is still more uncertain. If, on the other hand, it occurred in Jerusalem, whilst so many of the numbers were visitors only, it is obvious that the greater part must subsequently have left the Holy City and become scattered to their respective homes. The difficulty of obtaining information from more than a few of the 500 becomes obvious. In any case, from no authority which we are entitled to assume could Paul have been minutely informed of these appearances less than eight to ten years after they occurred, and then of the vision of the Eleven, only from one of the number to whom the first vision occurred. Now, no one who considers the operation of memory, even in persons of more than usual sobriety of imagination, dealing with circumstances not likely to be exaggerated or distorted by

Ewald, 38; *Meyer*, 35. *Wieseler*, Chronologie des apost. Zeitalters, 1848, Chronologische Tabelle; *Meyer*, Apg., p. 24.

feeling in the course of time, can doubt that, in ten years, all the circumstances of such occasions, amidst which much excitement certainly prevailed, must have assumed a very different aspect from what they originally bore. We may be permitted to quote a few words on this subject: "Though we are accustomed to speak of memory as if it consisted in an *exact* reproduction of past states of Consciousness, yet experience is continually showing us that this reproduction is very often *inexact*, through the modification which the 'trace' has undergone in the interval. Sometimes the trace has been partially obliterated; and what remains may serve to give a very erroneous (because imperfect) view of the occurrence. . . . . And where it is one in which our own Feelings are interested, we are extremely apt to lose sight of what goes against them, so that the representation given by Memory is altogether one-sided. This is continually demonstrated by the entire dissimilarity of the accounts of the same occurrence or conversation, which shall be given by two or more parties concerned in it, even when the matter is fresh in their minds, and they are honestly desirous of telling the truth. And this diversity will usually become still more pronounced with the lapse of time: the trace becoming gradually but unconsciously modified by the habitual course of thought and feeling; so that when it is so acted on after a lengthened interval as to bring up a reminiscence of the original occurrence, that reminiscence really represents, *not* the actual occurrence, but the modified trace of it."[1] This is specially likely to occur where, as in our case, there were Old Testament prophecies supposed to describe minutely the sufferings, death, and resurrection of the Messiah, to fur-

[1] *Carpenter*, Principles of Mental Psychology, 1876, p. 456.

nish lines upon which the transformation of memory must insensibly shape itself. Unconsciously, we may be certain, the misty outlines of the original transaction would acquire consistency and take form according to the tenor of so infallible an index. It would require a memory of iron and of more than stubborn doggedness to resist the unobtrusive influence of supposed prophecies. Be it clearly understood that we speak of an unconscious process, which is perfectly consistent with complete belief that the transformed trace is exactly what originally took place. But adhering more closely to the point before us, can we suppose that the account which Paul received of these appearances, after that lapse of time, was a perfectly sober and unwarped description of what actually took place? We think not. Is it possible that the vision of the 500, for instance, had escaped the maturing influence of time? or that of the Eleven? We believe that it is not possible. However, Paul does not give a single detail, and consequently this argument mainly affects the abstract value of all such evidence whether at first or second hand, but it likewise makes more vague the original transaction, so indefinitely sketched for us, which we have to explain. What was it the 500 really saw? "Jesus," says the report matured by time; and modern divines taking the statement in its most objective sense, demand an explanation of the unknown phenomenon which led 500 to believe that they actually saw the risen Master. Did the 500 originally think anything of the kind? What impression did the individuals receive? Did any two receive precisely the same impressions? There is not the slightest evidence that they did. Although Paul gives the most meagre report of these appearances that could well be conceived, it must be remembered that the

impression made upon his own mind was not by the events themselves, but by the narrative of the events recounted at least eight or ten years afterwards. There can be no doubt that, earlier, Paul the persecutor must also frequently have heard of the Resurrection, and of alleged occasions when Jesus had been seen after his death and burial, from persecuted members of the Christian community, but beyond the undefined certainty of this we are not entitled to go. That what he heard must have received warmth of colouring from the fire of persecution is most probable. Of this, however, we shall speak presently.

It is not necessary further to enlarge upon the superstition of the age of which we write. We have elsewhere quoted the opinion of an orthodox divine and Hebrew scholar on the character of the Jewish people about that period. "Not to be more tedious, therefore, in this matter," he says, "let two things only be observed: i. That the nation under the second Temple, was given to magical arts beyond measure; and ii. That it was given to an easiness of believing all manner of delusions beyond measure."[1] And again: "It is a disputable case whether the Jewish nation were more mad with superstition in matters of religion, or with superstition in curious arts."[2] Even supposing the Twelve to have been men of superior intelligence to most of their fellow countrymen of the period, it cannot reasonably be questioned that they were "men of like passions" and failings with the rest, and that, as were the most eminent men of all countries for centuries after, they were ignorant of the true order of nature, full of superstitious ideas

[1] *Lightfoot*, Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ; Works, ed. Pitman, 1823, xi. p. 81.

[2] Ib., xi. p. 299 f.

regarding cosmical phenomena, and ready at all times to believe in miracles and supernatural interference with the affairs of life. As Jews, moreover, they had inherited belief in angelic agency, and divine apparitions. The Old Testament is full of narratives in which Jehovah appears to the Patriarchs and Lawgivers of Israel. Celestial visions had been familiar to every Jew from his infancy, and the constant personal communications of the Almighty with his peculiar people were still the most sacred traditions of the nation. Nursed in the prevalent superstition of the time, educated by the Law and the Prophets to familiarity with the supernatural, and prepared by the fervid imagination of their race to recognize wonders in heaven and earth,[1] the disciples were naturally prepared for the great Christian Miracle. The special circumstances in which they were placed at the death of Jesus conduced in the highest degree to excite that expectant attention which, in their state of profound agitation, rendered them readily susceptible of extraordinary impressions. The disciples had for a long period followed Jesus and felt the influence of his elevated character. It may be doubted how far they had entered into the spirit of his sublime teaching, or understood the spiritual wisdom which lay beneath the noble simplicity of his language, but it cannot be doubted that his personal greatness must have produced a profound effect upon their minds. When they came at last to understand, if in a material and imperfect way, his views as to his Messianic character, they can have had little difficulty in believing, in spite of the mysterious lowliness and humility of his aspect, although

[1] Cf. *Ewald*, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel, vi. p. 345.

probably in a sense widely different from his own, that the hope of Israel had at last come, and that the hour of her redemption was at hand. It is probable that, as the enmity of the priests and rulers increased, and the danger of his position became more apparent, whilst he disdained unworthily to shrink from his public work, he must have felt all the peril before him, and observed the anxiety of his followers. It may be conceived that, under such circumstances, his teachings may have assumed even a higher spirituality than before and, rising above the clouds of the present, soared out into that calmer future when the religion he founded would be accepted by men, and become a light to the Gentiles and the glory of his people Israel. It is probable that he may have spoken of his death in spiritual terms as a sacrifice for them and for the world, which would secure the triumph of his work and regenerate mankind. Comforting those who had left all and followed him, but from whom he might so soon be parted, and knowing their doubts and fears, he must have re-assured their minds by inspiriting views of the inseparable nature of his union with those who loved him and did his commandments; his spirit dwelling within them and leading them safely through the world, in the peace and security of souls raised by the truth beyond the reach of its corruption and its wrong. That they must have felt the strongest conviction of his Messianic character, we think cannot be doubted, however confused may have been their ideas of the exact nature of his office and of the manner in which his coming was to secure the triumph of Israel. The shock to their expectations and the utter dissipation of their hopes which must have been felt in the first moment of his arrest, hurried trial, and cruel condem-

nation can well be imagined. It is probable that in that first moment of terror and bewilderment the disciples indeed all forsook him and fled. No one who had consorted with the Great Teacher, however, and felt the influence of his mind, could long have resisted the reaction to nobler thoughts of him. In all the bitterness of sorrow for the loss of their master and friend, in horror at his agonizing and shameful death, and in doubt, consternation, and almost despair, they must have gathered together again and spoken of these strange events. Believing Jesus to have been the Messiah, how could they interpret his death on the cross? If he was the Messiah could he thus die?[1] If Enoch and Elijah, if Moses, precursors of the Messiah, had not seen death, how could that prophet like unto Moses whom Jehovah had raised up end his career by a shameful death on the cross? Throughout that time of fiery trial and supreme mental agitation, they must have perpetually sought in their own minds some explanation of the terrible events then occurring and seeming to blast all their hopes, and doubtless mystic utterances of Jesus must have assumed new meanings, meanings probably different from his own. In the accounts of the coming Messiah in the prophets, they must have searched for some light by which to solve the inexplicable problem. Is it not conceivable that, in that last time of danger and darkness, when he saw the persecution against him become more vehement, and felt that the path which he had chosen led him through danger and distress perhaps to death, Jesus may, in the bitter contemplation of that fanatical opposition of bigotry and

[1] Cf. *Ewald*, Gesch. des Volkes Israel, vi. p. 72 a. ff.; *Holsten*, Zum Evang. des Paul. u. Petr., p. 193 f., p. 229 ff.

superstition have applied to himself the description of the suffering servant of Jehovah, suffering—as all noble souls have done who are in advance of their age, and preach great truths which condemn either directly or by implication the vices and follies of their time,—"the oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely," and, worse still, the ignoble insults of popular ignorance and fickleness? Here might seem to them the solution of the enigma; and returning from that first flight of terror and bewilderment, feeling all the intense reaction of affection and grief and faith in the Master quickened by shame at their abandonment of him in his moment of supreme danger and affliction, still believing that he must be the Messiah, and in mute longing and expectation of the next events which were to confirm or confound their hopes, the disciples must have been in the climax of nervous agitation and excitement, and ready to receive any impression which might be suggested in their embarrassment.[1]

According to Paul it was Peter who first saw the risen Jesus. According to the first and fourth Gospels, the first appearance was to the women, and notably, in the latter, to Mary Magdalene out of whom had been cast "seven devils," and whose temperament probably rendered her unusually susceptible of all such impressions. Did Paul intentionally omit all mention of the appearances to the women, or did he not know of them? In the latter case, we have an instructive light thrown on the Gospel tradition; in the former, the first suggestion

[1] Ewald points out that, according to the belief of the period, the souls of the dead hovered for a time between heaven and earth, and he considers that the belief undeniably played an important part in this sphere of visions of the Christ. Gesch. d. V. Isr., vi. p. 72 a.

of the Resurrection becomes even more clearly intelligible. It will be observed that in all this explanation we are left chiefly to conjecture, for the statements in the Gospels cannot, upon any point, be used with the slightest confidence. On the other hand, all that is demanded is that a probable or possible explanation of the origin of the belief in the Resurrection should be given; and in the total absence of historical data we are entitled to draw inferences as to the course of events at the time. It may well be that a mistake as to the sepulchre, rendered not improbable if any hint of the truth be conveyed in the conflicting traditions of the Gospel, or one of many other suggestions which might be advanced, might lead the women or Peter to believe that the sepulchre was empty. Or some other even trifling circumstance, which we no longer can indicate with precision, might convey to the women or to Peter, in their state of nervous excitement, the last impulse wanting to cause that rapid revulsion from extreme depression, which is so suitable to the state which we may perhaps be allowed to call creative subjectivity. If we are to accept the indications scattered about the New Testament, the impetuous ardent temperament of Peter was eminently one to bound into sudden ecstatic enthusiasm, and in all probability some commonplace or trifling incident may have been the spark which kindled into flame the materials already at glowing heat. The strong subjective impression that Jesus had risen would create a vision of him which, at once confirming previous conclusions, resolving perplexing doubts and satisfying feverish expectations, would be accepted by each mind with little or no question as an objective reality. If Peter, or even the

women, brought to the disciples the assurance that they had seen the Lord, we cannot doubt that, in the unparalleled position in which they were then placed, under all the circumstances of intense feeling and religious excitement at the moment, such emotions would be suddenly called into action as would give to these men the impression that they had seen the Master whom they had lost. These subjective impressions would be strengthened daily and unconsciously into ever more objective consistency, and being confirmed by supposed prophecy would be affirmed with a confidence insensibly inspired by dogmatic considerations.[1] That the news would fly from believer to believer, meeting everywhere excited attention and satisfying eager expectancy, is certain; and that these devout souls, swayed by every emotion of glad and exultant enthusiasm, would constantly mistake the suggestions of their own thoughts for objective realities is certain. Jesus died, was buried, and rose again "according to the Scriptures." This would harden every timid supposition into assurance; and as time went on, what was doubtful would become certain, what was mysterious, clear; and those who had seen nothing would take up and strengthen the tradition of those who had seen the Lord.

It is argued that there was not time for the preparation of the disciples to believe in the Resurrection of Jesus between his crucifixion and "the third day," when that event is alleged to have occurred, and, consequently, no probability of subjective impressions of so unexpected a nature being received. To those

[1] Cf. *Ewald*, Gesch. des Volkes Israel, vi. p. 72 a. ff.; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paul. u. Petr., p. 229 ff.; *Keim*, Jesu v. Nazara, iii. p. 590 ff.

apologists who adopt this argument we might point to many passages in the Gospels, which affirm that the resurrection on the third day was predicted. These, however, we assign of course to a later date. The argument assumes that there was no preparation in the teaching of Jesus, which, as we have endeavoured to suggest, is not the case. If there had been no other, the mere assurance that he was the Messiah must have led to reflections, which demanded some other sequel to his career than the death of a slave. The mere suggestion of such a problem as must have proposed itself to the minds of the disciples: If all is to end here, Jesus was not the Messiah: if he was the Messiah, what will now happen?—must have led to expectant attention. But there was much more than this. In such moments as those of the Passion, thought works feverishly and fast. It is not to be supposed that Peter and the rest did not foresee the end, when Jesus was led away prisoner in the hands of his enemies. It is still less to be imagined that their minds were not ceaselessly revolving that problem, on the solution of which depended their fondest hopes and highest aspirations.[1] It is most probable, indeed, that no time could have found the disciples in a state so ripe for strong impressions as that immediately succeeding the death of their Master. There are, however, other aspects in which this point may be placed. What evidence is there that Jesus was seen, or supposed to have been seen, on the third day? Absolutely none worthy of the name. Paul does not say that he was, and as for the Gospels their

[1] Cf. *Holsten*, Zum Ev. des Paul. u. Petr., p. 233 f.

statement is of no value, and the tradition which they record may be set down as a foregone dogmatic conclusion. Paul very distinctly shows this. He says: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he has been raised the third day, according to the Scriptures."[1] The repetition of the phrase "according to the Scriptures" is very marked, and points to the fact that the purpose for which Jesus died—"for our sins"—and the date of his resurrection—"the third day"—are statements directly based upon Scripture. We have mentioned that the Scriptures supposed to indicate the third day, do not really apply to the Messiah at all, but this does not affect the question before us. Now believing this epoch to be defined in prophecy, this is precisely one of those points upon which memory would, in the lapse of time, be most likely to adjust itself to the prophecy. We will assume that Jesus was not "seen" before the third day. It is obvious that if he was seen forty days after, it might be affirmed that he had been actually raised long before, on the third day. The vision occurring on the third day itself even could not prove that he had not "risen" before. There is, in fact, no way that we can see of fixing the third day except the statement of "Scripture," and, the moment we accept that, we must recognize the force of dogmatic influence.[2] The fact that the third day has from early

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 3 f.

[2] We do not go into any argument based on the order given in the first two Synoptics to go into Galilee—a three days' journey at least—where the disciples were to see Jesus. Nor need we touch upon other similar points which arise out of the narratives of the Gospels.

times been set apart as the Christian Sabbath, does not prove anything. If the third day was believed to be the day indicated by "Scripture" for the Resurrection, of course that day would be selected as the time at which it must have occurred, and on which it should be commemorated. So far as the vision hypothesis is concerned, the day is of no consequence whatever, and the objection upon this point has no force.

There is another consideration which we must mention, which is not only important in connection with an estimate of the evidence for the Resurrection, but the inferences from which clearly support the explanation we are proposing. Before stating it we may, in passing, again refer to the fact that it is nowhere affirmed that anyone was an eye-witness of the actual Resurrection. It is supposed to be proved by the circumstance that Jesus was subsequently "seen." Observe, however, that the part of this miracle which could not well have been ascribed to subjective impressions — the actual resurrection — is, naturally enough, not seen by anyone, but that which comes precisely within the scope of such subjective action is said to have been seen by many. To come at once to our point, however, neither Paul, nor the Gospels, nor Christian tradition in any form, pretends that Jesus was seen by any one but his disciples and those who believed in him. In fact, Jesus only appeared to those who were prepared by faith and expectant attention to see him in the manner we assert. We are at present merely speaking of the earlier appearances, and reserving Paul for separate discussion. Why, we may inquire, did Jesus not appear to his

enemies as well as to his friends?[1] Nothing of course could have been more intelligible than his desire to comfort and reassure those who believed in and mourned for him, but to do this by no means excluded a wider manifestation of himself, supposing him to have actually risen from the dead. On the hypothesis that he only rose again and was seen through the yearning and enthusiastic faith of his followers, the reason why he was not seen by others is not hard to find. Yet it might be thought that the object of at once establishing beyond doubt his supernatural mission, and convincing his enemies of their crime, and the Jews of their blindness and folly, was important enough. Had he shown himself to the Chief Priests and elders, and confounded the Pharisees with the vision of him whom they had so cruelly nailed to the accursed tree, how might not the future of his followers have been smoothed, and the faith of many made strong! Or if he had stood again in the Courts of the Roman Procurator, no longer a prisoner buffeted and spat upon, but the glorious Messiah, beyond the reach of Jewish malignity or Roman injustice. But no, he was seen by none but those devoted to him. We shall of course be told by apologists that this also was "for the trial of our faith;" though to anyone who earnestly reflects, it must seem childish to ask men to believe what is beyond their reason, yet conceal the evidence by which reason is supposed to be guided. The reply, however, is clear: for the trial of our faith or for any other reason, it is nevertheless certain that this evidence does not exist.

[1] Cf. *Schenkel*, Das Charakterbild Jesu, 2te Aufl., 1864, p. 324; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. des Paulus u. Petr., p. 124.

When the argument which we are now discussing was first advanced long ago by Celsus, Origen had no better refutation than, after admitting the fact that Jesus was not after his resurrection seen as before publicly and by all men, to take refuge in the belief that the passage of Paul regarding his appearances contains wonderful mysteries which, if understood, would explain why Jesus did not show himself after that event as he had done before it.[1]

We must now proceed to show that the vision of Paul is satisfactorily explained by the same hypothesis.[2] We have already proved that there is no evidence of any value that Paul's conversion was due to his having seen Jesus in a manner which he believed to be objective and supernatural. To represent the arch persecutor Paul transformed in a moment, by a miraculous vision of Jesus, into the Apostle of the Gentiles was highly characteristic of the Author of

[1] Contra Cels., ii. 63. It is curious that, in an earlier chapter, Origen, discussing the question of Celsus, whether any one who had been actually dead had ever risen with a real body, says that if Celsus had been a Jew who believed that Elijah and Elisha had raised little children he could not have advanced this objection. Origen adds that he thinks the reason why Jesus appeared to no other nation but the Jews was, that they had become accustomed to miracles, and could, by comparing the works of Jesus and what was told of him with what had been done before, recognize that he was greater than all who had preceded him. ii. 57.

[2] *Baur*, Paulus, i. p. 75 ff.; *Davidson*, Int. N. T., ii. p. 247 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Allg. Biblioth. d. bibl. Lit., vi. p. 1 ff.; *Ewald*, Gesch. V. Isr., vi. p. 95 f., 345 ff.; *Hausrath*, Der Ap. Paulus, p. 134 ff.; in Schenkel's B. L., iv. p. 418; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1864, p. 155 ff.; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus, u. s. w., p. 1 ff., 65 ff.; *Keim*, Der gesch. Christus, 1866, p. 134, 137; cf. Jesu v. Naz., iii. p. 540 ff; *Lang*, Religiöse Charaktere, i. 1862, p. 15 ff.; *Meijboom*, Jezus' Opstanding, p. 99 ff.; *Noack*, Der Urspr. d. Christenthums, ii. p. 274 f.; *Pfleiderer*, Der Paulinismus, p. 14 ff.; *Renan*, Les Apôtres, p. 178 ff.; *Schrader*, Der Ap. Paulus, v. p. 529; *Straatman*, Paulus, p. 21 ff.; *Weber u. Holtzmann*, Gesch. V. Isr., ii. p. 541 ff.; *Zeller*, Apg., p. 195 ff. Cf. *Jowett*, Eps. of St. Paul, i. p. 230 ff.; *Usteri*, Br. Gal., p. 26; *Weisse*, Die ev. Gesch., ii. p. 412 f.

Acts, who further represents Paul as immediately preaching publicly in Damascus and confounding the Jews. Widely different is the statement of Paul. He distinctly affirms that he did not communicate with flesh and blood, nor went he up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles before him but that he immediately went away into Arabia. The Fathers delighted in representing this journey to Arabia as an instance of Paul's fervour and eagerness to preach the Gospel in lands over which its sound had not yet gone forth. There can be no doubt, however, we think, that Paul's journey to Arabia and his sojourn there were for the purpose of reflection.[1] It is only in legends that instantaneous spiritual revolutions take place. In sober history the process is more slow and progressive. We repeat that there is no evidence which can at all be accepted that Paul's conversion was effected by a vision, and that it is infinitely more probable that it was, so to say, merely completed and crowned by seeing Jesus; but, at the same time, even if the representation be adopted that this vision was the decisive circumstance which induced Paul at once to resign his course of persecution and embrace Christianity, our argument is not materially affected. In any case, much silent, deep, and almost unconscious preparation for the change must long before have commenced in the mind of Paul, which was finally matured in the Arabian waste. Upon no view that is taken can this be excluded; upon every ground of common sense, experience, and necessary inference, it must be ad-

[1] *Bisping*, Ex. H'buch N. T., vi. 1, p. 187; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus, p. 269, anm.; *Lightfoot*, Galatians, p. 90; *Schrader*, Der Ap. P. v. p. 263. Cf. *Alford*, Gk. Test., iii. p. 9; *Ellicott*, Galatians, p. 17 f.; *Neander*, Pflanzung, p. 123; *de Wette*, Br. an d. Gal., p. 19.

mitted. Indifference is the only great gulf which separates opinions. There was no stolid barrier of apathy between Saul of Tarsus and belief in the Messiahship of Jesus. In persecuting Christianity, Paul proved two things: the earnestness and energy of his convictions, and the fact that his attention was keenly directed to the new sect. Both points contributed to the result we are discussing. Paul's judaism was no mere formalism. It was the adoption, heart and soul, of the religion of his people; which was to him no dead principle, but a living faith stimulating that eager impetuous character to defend its integrity with "fire and sword." He did not, like so many of his countrymen, turn away with scorn from the followers of the despised Nazarene and leave them to their delusion; but turned to them, on the contrary, with the fierce attraction of the zealot whose own belief is outraged by the misbelief of others. The earnest Jew came into sharp collision with the earnest Christian. The earnestness of each was an element of mutual respect. The endurance and firmness of the one might not melt the bigoted resolution of the other, but it arrested his attention and commanded his unconscious sympathy. Just so would the persecutor have endured and resisted persecution; so, subsequently, he actually did meet it. And what was the main difference between the persecutor and the persecuted? It consisted in that which constituted the burden of the apostolic preaching: the belief that "this was the Christ." The creed of the new sect at least was not complicated. It was little more at that time than a question of identity, until Paul himself developed it into an elaborate system of theology.

In this question of identity, however, there was comprised a vast change of national ideas. To the devout Jew,—looking for the hope of Israel, yearning and praying for the advent of that Son of David who was to sit upon the throne of his fathers, restore the fortunes of the people, drive out the heathen and subdue the nations again to the yoke of Israel, establishing the worship of Jehovah in its purity and turning the Gentiles to the service of the God of Gods,—it was an abhorrent thought that the lowly peasant who had died a shameful death on Golgotha should be represented as the Messiah, the promised King of the Jews. Still there was something sufficiently startling in the idea to excite reflection. A political aspirant, who pretended to play the part, and after some feeble attempt at armed insurrection had been crushed by the heel of the Roman, could not have attracted attention. In that, there would have been no originality to astonish, and no singularity to require explanation. This man, on the contrary, who was said to be the Messiah, assumed no earthly dignity; claimed no kingdom in this world; had not even a place to lay his head; but ended a short and unambitious career as the teacher of a simple but profound system of morality by death on a cross. There was no vulgar imitation here. This was the reverse of the Messiah of the Jews. ..In spite of so much dissimilarity, however, there was in the two parties a fundamental agreement of belief. The Jew expected the Messiah; the Christian believed he had now come. The Messiah expected by the Jew was certainly a very different Saviour from the despised and rejected Jesus of Nazareth, but at the root of the

Christian faith lay belief in a Messiah. It was a thoroughly Jewish belief, springing out of the covenant with the fathers, and based upon the Law and the Prophets. The difference was not one of principle but one of details. Their interpretation of the promises was strangely dissimilar, but the trust of both was in the God of Israel. To pass from one to the other did not involve the adoption of a new religion, but merely a modification of the views of the old. Once convinced that the Messiah was not a political ruler but a spiritual guide, not a victorious leader, but a suffering servant of Jehovah, the transition from judaic hopes to recognition of Jesus was almost accomplished. It is clear that Paul in his capacity of Persecutor must have become well acquainted with the views of the Christians, and probably must have heard them repeatedly expounded by his captives before the Jewish Sanhedrin.[1] He must have heard the victims of his blind religious zeal affirming their faith with all that ecstatic assurance which springs out of persecution. The vision of Peter contributed to the vision of Paul. There can be no doubt that Paul must have become aware of the application to Jesus of Old Testament prophecies, and of the new conception thence derived of a suffering Messiah. The political horizon was certainly not suggestive of the coming of the Lord's Anointed. Never had the fortunes of Israel been at a lower ebb. The hope of a Prince of the house of David to restore dominion to the fallen race was hard to entertain. The suggestion of an alternative theory based upon a new interpretation of the prophets, if startling, was not untimely, when the old confidence

[1] *Hausrath*, Der Ap. Paulus, 2 Aufl., 1872, p. 130 f.

was becoming faint in many minds, and the hope of his coming seemed so distant and unsure. If we do not misjudge the character of Paul, however shocked he may have been at first by the substitution of a crucified Nazarene for the triumphant Messiah of his earlier visions, there must have been something profoundly pleasing to his mind in the conception of a spiritual Messiah. As he became familiar with the idea, it is probable that flashes of doubt must have crossed his mind as to the correctness of his more material views. If the belief were true, which Christians professed, that this Jesus, despised and rejected of men, was actually the suffering servant of Jehovah, and this servant of Jehovah the Messiah! If the claim of this Jesus who had been esteemed smitten of God and afflicted, had been verified by his rising again from the dead and ascending to the right hand of God! This aspect of the Messianic idea had a mystery and significance congenial to the soul of Paul. The supernatural elements could have presented no difficulties to him. Belief in the Resurrection was part of his creed as a Pharisee. That the risen Messiah should have been seen by many, the fundamental idea once admitted, could not surprise the visionary Jew. We can well imagine the conflict which went on in the ardent mind of Paul when doubts first entered it; his resistance and struggle for the faith of his youth; the pursuance as duty of the course he had begun, whilst the former conviction no longer strengthened the feverish energy; the excitement of religious zeal in the mad course of persecution, not to be arrested in a moment, but become, by growing doubt, bitterness and pain to him; the suffering

inflicted sending its pang into his own flesh. There was ample preparation in such a situation for the vision of Paul.

The constitution and temperament of the Apostle were eminently calculated to receive impressions of the strongest description.[1] We have mentioned the conjecture of many able men that his "stake in the flesh" was a form of epilepsy. It is, of course, but a conjecture, though one which has great probability,[2] and we must not treat it otherwise; but, if it could be proved correct, much light would be thrown upon Paul's visions. We have discussed the Apostle's statements regarding the supernatural Charismata in the Church, and have seen his extreme readiness to believe in the lavish bestowal of miraculous gifts where others could recognise but ordinary qualities. That Paul should be able to claim the power of speaking with tongues more than all the Corinthians, whose exercise of that spiritual gift he so unceremoniously restrains, is in perfect keeping with all that we elsewhere learn about him. Everywhere we find the keenly impressionable nature so apt to fall into the ecstatic state when brought under the influence of active religious emotion. "I must glory," he exclaims with irresistible impulse on coming to a theme so congenial to him, "I must glory; it is not indeed expedient, but I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord."[3] Even when he speaks of the stake in his flesh, which he does in such suggestive connection with his visions, he describes it as sent lest he should "be exalted above measure by the

[1] Cf. *Holsten*, Zum Ev. des Paulus, u. s. w., p. 84 ff.

[2] Cf. Gal. iv. 13; 1 Cor. ii. 3.

[3] Καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, οὐ συμφέρον μὲν, ἐλεύσομαι δὲ εἰς ὀπτασίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου. 2 Cor. xii. 1.

excess of the revelations."[1] We have so repeatedly had to refer to Paul's claim to have received his Gospel by special revelation that we need not again speak of it here. If we could quote Acts as a genuine representation of Christian tradition regarding Paul, we might point out the visions and revelations therein so freely ascribed to him, but his own writings are amply sufficient for our purpose. Even his second journey to Jerusalem is attributed to the direction of revelation.[2] The only vision regarding which the Apostle gives any particulars is that referred to, 2 Cor. xii. 2: "I know a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body I know not, whether out of the body I know not, God knoweth), such an one caught up even unto the third heaven. 3. And I know such a man (whether in the body or out of the body I know not, God knoweth), 4. that he was caught up into paradise and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter. 5. For such an one will I boast," etc.[3] It has been argued from this passage and the repetition of the expression "whether in the body or out of the body I know not," that Paul himself could clearly distinguish objective facts from subjective impressions.[4] No interpretation could well be more erroneous. It is evident that Paul has no doubt whatever of his having been in the third heaven and in Paradise, and as little of his having heard the unspeakable words. That is quite

[1] 2 Cor. xii. 7. [2] Gal. ii. 2.

[3] 2 Cor. xii. 2. *Οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων, εἴτε ἐν σώματι οὐκ οἶδα, εἴτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν, ἁρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ. 3. καὶ οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον, εἴτε ἐν σώματι εἴτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν, 4. ὅτι ἡρπάγη εἰς τὸν παράδεισον καὶ ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι. 5. ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοιούτου καυχήσομαι, κ. τ. λ.*

[4] Cf. *Neander*, Pflanzung, u. s. w., p. 154; *Paul*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1863, p. 201; *Westcott*, Gospel of the Resurrection, p. 112, note 1.

objectively real to him. His only doubt is whether the body was caught up with his soul upon this occasion.[1] No one who has carefully considered such phenomena and examined the statements here made can have any doubt as to the nature of this vision. The conception of being caught up into "the third heaven," "into Paradise," and there hearing these "unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter," betrays in no doubtful manner the source of the subjective impressions. Of course, divines who are prepared to see in this passage the account of an actual objective event will not consider it evidence that Paul had subjective visions which he believed to have been objective facts; but to those who, more rightly and reasonably, we think, re-recognize the subjective character of the vision, it must at once definitely settle the point that Paul could mistake subjective impressions for objective realities, and consequently the argument for the similar subjectivity of the vision of Jesus becomes complete. The possibility of such a mistake is precisely what apologists question. Here is an instance in which the mistake has clearly been made by Paul. The Apostle's own statements show him to have been superlatively visionary and impressionable, with restless nervous energy it is true, but, at the same time, with keen physical and mental susceptibility. Liable to be uplifted by "the excess of revelations," glorying in "visions and revelations of the Lord," possessing ecstatic powers more than all others, subjecting his very movements, his visits to

[1] *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Theol., 1864, p. 174 f.; *Holsten*, Zum Ev. Paulus u. Petr., p. 21 ff., p. 122 f. *Hilgenfeld* points out that the representation of such a separation from the body as Paul here contemplates is to be found in *Philo* (De Somniis, i. § 6).

Jerusalem, to the direction of impulses which he supposed to be revelations: there has never been a case in which both temperament and religious belief more thoroughly combined to ascribe, with perfect conviction, objective reality to subjective impressions, connected with divine things then occupying his mind. Paul moreover lived in a time when the Messianic longing of the Jews made them profoundly interested students of the later apocalyptic writings, which certainly made a deep impression upon the Apostle, and in which he must have been struck by the image of the promised Messiah, like the Son of Man, coming on the clouds of heaven (Dan. xii. 13, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 47).[1] At no time was such a vision more likely to present itself to him, than when his mind was fixed upon the Messianic idea with all the intensity of one who had been persecuting those who asserted that the Messiah had already come. Here was reason for all that concentration of thought upon the subject which produces such visions, and when doubt and hesitation entered into that eager intense spirit, the conflict must have been sharp and the nerves highly strung. The Jesus whom he saw with his mind's eye was the climax of conviction in such a nature; and the vision vividly brought to him his own self-reproachful thoughts for cruelly mistaken zeal, and the remorse of noble souls which bounds to reparation. He devoted himself as eagerly to Christianity, as he had previously done to Judaism. He changed the contents but not the form of his mind.[2] Paul the Christian was the same man as Paul the Jew; and in

[1] *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1864, p. 183.

[2] *Holsten*, Zum Ev. des Paulus u. Petr., p. 84 ff.; *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschr. wiss. Th., 1864, p. 188 ff.

abandoning the conception of a Messiah "according to the flesh," and placing his whole faith in one "according to the spirit," he displayed the same characteristics as before. The revolution in his mind, of which so much is said, was merely one affecting the Messianic idea. He did not at a bound become the complete Apostle of the Gentiles, but accepting at first nothing more than belief in a Messiah according to the spirit, his comprehensive and peculiar system of theology was, of course, only the result of subsequent reflection. That his conviction should have been completed by a subjective vision is no more strange than that he should believe in supernatural Charismata, miraculous speaking with tongues, and being actually caught up into the third heaven, into Paradise, and hearing there unutterable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter. Paul evidently never questioned the source of his visions. They were simply accepted as divine revelations, and they excited all the less of misgiving in his soul from the fact that, without doubt, they expressed the expected solution of problems which intensely occupied his mind, and reflected conclusions already practically formed by his own thoughts.[1]

There remain two points to be briefly considered. The first of these is the assertion, constantly made in

[1] "If those appearances (to his disciples) were purely *subjective*," objects a recent writer, "how can we account for their sudden, rapid, and total cessation?" (*Farrar*, Life of Christ, ii. p. 432, note 1.) We might reply that, if objective, such a cessation would be still more unaccountable. Being subjective, the appearances of course ceased when the conditions of excitement and expectancy which produced them passed away. But in point of fact they did not suddenly and totally cease. The appearance to Paul occurred after a considerable interval, and there is the tradition of more than one appearance to him; but throughout the history of the Church we hear of similar subjective visions whenever a fitting individual has been found in the state to receive them.

various shapes, that the cardinal miracles of the Resurrection and Ascension were proclaimed as unquestionable facts, without contradiction, at a time when such an assertion might have been easily refuted. The production of the body, the still occupied sepulchre, it is said, would have set such pretentions at rest. It is unnecessary to say that the proclamation of the Resurrection and Ascension as facts proved nothing beyond the belief, perhaps, of those who asserted them. So far as Paul is concerned, we may seek in vain for any assertion of a bodily Ascension. But there is not the slightest evidence to show when the Resurrection and Ascension were first publicly proclaimed as unquestionable facts. Even the Gospels do not state that they were mentioned beyond the circle of disciples. The second Synoptist, who does not state that Jesus himself was seen by any one, makes the curious affirmation at the close of his Gospel as we have it, that the women, on receiving the announcement of the Resurrection from the angels, and the command for the disciples and Peter to go into Galilee, "went out and fled from the sepulchre; for trembling and astonishment seized them, and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid."[1] In the fourth Gospel, although the "beloved disciple" went into the sepulchre, "and he saw and believed," it is related of him and Peter: "So the disciples went away again unto their own home."[2] The Eleven, in fact, who all forsook their Master and fled; who are represented as meeting with closed doors "for fear of the Jews:" with closed doors after eight days, it is again said, although, a week before, ten of them are said to have seen Jesus, were not likely to expose themselves to the fate of Jesus by rushing into the highways

[1] Mk. xvi. 8. [2] John xx. 10.

and asserting the Resurrection. Beyond the statement of the Gospels, the value of which we have seen, and a statement accompanied by so many confused circumstances, there is no evidence whatever that the sepulchre was found empty. There is no evidence that the sepulchre was really known to the disciples, none of whom, probably, was present at the crucifixion; and it might well be inferred that the women, who are represented as ignorant that the body had already been embalmed, yet who are the chief supposed witnesses for the empty sepulchre and the informants of the disciples, were equally ignorant of the sepulchre in which the body was laid. We might ask whether the 500 brethren who are said to have seen Jesus at the same time came from Galilee, or wherever they were, and examined the state of the sepulchre? We have already said, however, that if the sepulchre had been shown to be empty, the very last thing which could be proved by that circumstance would be the correctness of the assertion that it had become so in consequence of a stupendous miracle. On the other hand, if it had been shown that it was occupied by a body, it is exceedingly doubtful whether the fact would have convinced any one not previously sure that Jesus could not have risen from the dead, and he would not have required such evidence. When the Resurrection was publicly proclaimed as a fact, the body could no longer have been recognizable, and the idea that any of those in authority could have thought such demonstration necessary to refute a story whispered about amongst an obscure sect in Jerusalem, or even more courageously asserted, is a product of later times. When Jesus of Nazareth, the head of the nascent sect, was suppressed by a shameful death, his humble and timid followers

were obviously for a time despised; and there is little reason to suppose that the chief priests and rulers of the Jews would have condescended to any public contradiction of their affirmations, if they had even felt indifference to the defilement of exposing a decaying body to the gaze of Jerusalem. This kind of refutation is possible only in the imagination of divines. Besides, what evidence is there that even a single indifferent person found the sepulchre empty? There is not an iota of proof.

On the contrary, there is the very strongest evidence that when the assertion of the Resurrection and Ascension as "unquestionable facts" was made, it was contradicted in the only practical and practicable way conceivable: 1. by all but universal disbelief in Jerusalem; 2. by actual persecution of those who asserted it. It is a perfectly undeniable fact that the great mass of the Jews totally denied the truth of the statement by disbelieving it, and that the converts to Christianity who soon swelled the numbers of the Church and spread its influence amongst the nations were not the citizens of Jerusalem, who were capable of refuting such assertions, but strangers and Gentiles. The number of the community of Jerusalem after the forty days seems to be stated by the Author of Acts as "about 120," and although the numbers added to the Church, according to this document, are evidently fabulous, the converts at Pentecost are apparently chiefly from amongst the devout men of every nation upon earth congregated at Jerusalem. To this hour the Jews have retained as their inheritance the denial by their forefathers of the asserted facts. The assertion, moreover, was emphatically denied by persecution as soon as it became worth any one's while to persecute those who made it. It was in this way denied by Paul himself, at

a time when verification was infinitely more possible than when he came to join in the assertion. Are we to suppose that the Apostle took no trouble to convince himself of the facts before he began to persecute? He was in the confidence of the high priests it seems, can he ever have heard the slightest doubt from them on the subject? Is it not palpable that Paul and his party, by their very pursuit of those who maintained such allegations, stigmatized them as falsehoods, and perhaps as imposture? If it be said that Paul became convinced of his mistake, it is perfectly obvious that his conversion was not due to local and circumstantial evidence, but to dogmatic considerations and his supposed vision of Jesus. He disbelieved when the alleged occurrences were recent and, as it is said, capable of refutation; he believed when the time for such refutation had passed.

The second point to which we have referred is the vague and final objection of apologists that, if the vision of Jesus was merely subjective, the fabric of the Church and even of Christianity is based upon unreality and self-deception. Is this possible? they ask. Is it possible that for eighteen centuries the Resurrection and Ascension have been proclaimed and believed by millions, with no other original foundation than self-delusion? The vagueness and apparent vastness of this objection, perhaps, make it a formidable *argumentum ad hominem*, but it vanishes into very small proportions as we approach it. Must we then understand that the dogmas of all religions which have been established must have been objective truths? and that this is a necessary inference from their wide adoption? If so, then all historical religions before Christianity, and after it, must take rank as substantially true. In that case the religion

of the Veda, of Buddha, of Zoroaster, of Mahomet, for instance, can as little be based on unreality and self-deception as Christianity. They have secured wide acceptance from mankind. Millions have for centuries held their tenets as sacredly as those of Christianity, and to this day the followers of Sâkya Muni are as numerous as the believers in the religion of Paul. If not, the objection at once falls to the ground as an argument, and the problem becomes a simple matter of evidence, which has been fully discussed and disposed of. When we analyse the fact, it becomes apparent that, ultimately, belief in the Resurrection and Ascension resolves itself into the belief of a few or of one. It requires very little reflection to perceive that the Christian Church is founded much more upon belief in the Resurrection than on the fact itself.[1] Nothing is more undeniable than the circumstance that not more than a very small number of men are even alleged to have seen the risen Jesus. The mass of those who have believed in the Resurrection have done so because of the assurance of these few men, and perhaps because they may have been led to think that the event was predicted in Scripture. Up to this day, converts to the dogma are made if made at all, upon the assurance of Paul and the Gospels. The vast question at last dwindles down to the inquiry: Can a few men, can one man, draw erroneous inferences and be honestly deceived by something which he supposes he has seen? We presume that there can be no hesitation in giving an affirmative reply. The rest follows as a matter of course. Others simply believe the report of those who have believed before them. In course of time, so many

[1] *Baur*, Gesch. d. Christ. Kirche, 1863, i. p. 40.

believe that it is considered almost outrageous to disbelieve or demand evidence. The number of those who have believed is viewed at last as an overwhelming proof of the truth of the creed.

It is a most striking and extraordinary fact that the life and teaching of Jesus have scarcely a place in the system of Paul. Had we been dependent upon him we should have had no idea of the Great Master who preached the Sermon on the Mount, and embodied pure truths in parables of such luminous simplicity. His noble morality would have remained unknown, and his lessons of incomparable spiritual excellence have been lost to the world. Paul sees no significance in that life, but concentrates all interest in the death and resurrection of his Messiah. In the sepulchre hewn out of the rock are deposited the teaching and example of Jesus, and from it there rises a mystic Christ lost in a halo of theology. The ecclesiastical Christianity which was mainly Paul's work has almost effaced the true work of Jesus. Too little can now be traced of that teaching, and few are the genuine records of his work which have survived the pious enthusiasm evoked by his character. Theology has done its worst with the life; and that death, which will ever be the darkest blot upon history, has been represented as the climax of divine beneficence. The Resurrection and Ascension have deified Jesus of Nazareth; but they have done so at the expense of all that was most truly sublime in his work. The world will gain when it recognises the real character and source of such dogmas, and resigns this

inheritance from the Age of Miracles. For, although we lose a faith which has long been our guide in the past, we need not now fear to walk boldly with Truth in the future, and turning away from fancied benefits to be derived from the virtue of his death, we may find real help and guidance from more earnest contemplation of the life and teaching of Jesus.

INDEX.

Abercrombie, Dr., p. 531 f.

Acts of the Apostles: miracles in, p. 1: first distinct mention of, 2; alleged evidence of Clement of Rome, 3 ff.; of Ep. of Barnabas, 7; of Hermas, 8 ff.; of Ignatian Epistles, 10 ff.; of Polycarp, 13 ff.; of Justin Martyr, 15 ff.; of Hegesippus, 18; of Papias, 19 ff.; of Ep. to Diognetus, 21 f.; of Marcion, 22; of Tatian, 22 f.; of Dionysius of Corinth, 23 f.; of Athenagoras, 24; of Ep. of Vienne and Lyons, 24 ff.; of Canon of Muratori, 26 f.; of Irenæus, 2; 27; 33; 34 f.; of Clement of Alexandria, 27; of Tertullian, 27; of Origen, 27; rejected by heretical sects, 27 f.; doubts of authorship, 28; ascribed to Clement of Rome and Barnabas, 28; title 28; continuation of third Gospel, 28 f.; conclusion from external evidence, 28 f.; evidence regarding authorship, 31 ff.; regarding Luke the traditional author, 33 ff.; superscription of, 37 ff.; ἡμεῖς sections, 40 ff.; sources, 47 ff.; author's peculiarities throughout, 48 ff.; author not Luke, 50; nor companion of Paul, 51 ff.; contradictions and omissions of Paul's history, 51 ff.; Timothy supposed author of, 59; Silas, 59; Titus, 60; author unknown, 60; inadequate as evidence for miracles, 61; historical value, 62 ff.; design, 63 ff.; title, 66; limited scope, 67 ff.; incompleteness as history, 68 f.; parallelism between Peter and Paul, 70 ff.; the speeches, 72 ff.; not historical, 73 ff.; brevity of speeches, 75 ff.; author's peculiarities throughout speeches, 78 ff.; all quotations from Septuagint, 80; speeches composed by author, 81 ff.; speech of Peter at Pentecost, 82 ff.; Peter's speeches compared with Paul's, 84 ff., 90 ff.; apologetic argument, 88 ff.; fundamental similarity of speeches, 91 ff.; alleged analogy between Peter's language in Acts and in Epistles, 92 ff.; alleged traces of translation, 94 ff.; speech of Peter, i. 16 ff., 99 ff.; death of Judas, 107 f.; historical value of, 109 ff.; representation of the Apostolic Age in, 111 ff.; Stephen the Martyr, 146 ff.; his speech, how reported? 155 ff.; contradictions of O. T., 157; similarity to speeches of Paul and Peter, 159 ff.; linguistic analysis of speech of Stephen, 164 ff.; result of analysis, 175 ff.; first persecution, 179 f.; Philip in Samaria, 180 f.; Philip and Eunuch, 181 ff.; Peter at Lydda, 183 f.; at Joppa, 184 ff., 193; conversion of Cornelius, 186 ff.; vision abrogated distinction of clean and unclean animals, 195 f.; inconsistent with Peter's conduct at Antioch, 196 ff.; episode of Cornelius unhistorical, 199 f.; Paul's conduct after conversion, 204 ff.; his first visit to Jerusalem, 207 ff; Paul's vision in Temple, 215 f.; Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, 216 ff.; not second visit of Acts, 219 ff; third visit of Acts, 221 ff.; discrepancy of the two narratives, 224 ff.; motive of visit, 227 ff.; the public congress, 230 ff.; speech of Peter, 236 ff.; compared with conduct at Antioch, 242 ff.; speech of James at Council, 247 ff.; the Apostolic letter, 256 ff.; spirit of the decree, 262 ff.; Paul's mission according to Acts, 287 ff.; circumcision of Timothy, 294 ff.; *rôle* of Paul in, not historical, 303 ff.; conclusions arrived at, 319 f.; Gift of Tongues at Pentecost, 367 ff.; origin of the account, 376 ff.; Acts as evidence, 405 f.; conversion of Paul, 509 ff.

Æneas the paralytic, p. 183 f.

Alford, Dean, p. 17 n. 4, 469 n. 3.

Amos ix. 11 f.; p. 249 ff.

Apocalypse and Paul, p. 313 ff.

Apollinaris, Claudius, p. 24.

Apollinaris of Laodicæa, p. 19.

Aristion, p. 33 n. 2.

Articles of Church of England, p. 400 n. 1.

Ascension: same day as resurrection, p. 103 n. 2; 571 f.; allegation regard-

ing the, 400 ff.; evidence required, 402 ff.; account in Mark and Luke, 470 ff.; account in Acts, 472 ff; idea of Ascension not original in Christianity, 474; value of evidence of Gospels and Acts, 475 ff.
Athenagoras, alleged evidence for Acts, p. 24.
Augustine, p. 148, 365.

Barnabas, Ep. of: alleged evidence for Acts, p. 7; 473 n. 1.
Basilides, p. 22.
Basnage, p. 33 n. 3.
Baur, p. 148, 155, 185 f., 190.
Beelen, p. 292 n. 2.
Bertholdt, p. 335.
Beyschlag, p. 491, n. 2.
Bleek, p. 56 n. 1, 95 ff., 97 f., 152 n. 2, 155 n. 3, 181, 257 f.
Brodie, Sir B., p. 527.

Calvin, p. 33 n. 3; 233.
Canon of Muratori: evidence for Acts, p. 26 f.
Carpenter, Dr., p. 528 ff., 533 f., 535, 538.
Celsus, p. 26, 550, 551 n. 1.
Charismata: referred to, Gal. iii. 5, p. 337 f.; in Corinthian Church, 344 ff.; bestowed on whole Church, 354 ff.; not supernatural, 356 ff.; no practical trace of them, 356 ff; Tongues, 361 ff.; interpretation of Tongues, 385 ff.; none miraculous, 392 ff.
Christianity, primitive: p. 109 ff.; developed out of Judaism, p. 114 ff.; only distinguished from Judaism by belief in Jesus as Messiah, 116 ff.; Jew believing in Jesus as Messiah became a Christian, 121 f.; involved no breach with Judaism, 122 ff.; obligation of law continued, 123 ff.; Jesus confined ministry to Jews, 128 ff.; instructions to the Twelve, 131 f.; appointment of seventy disciples, 132 ff.; their alleged mission, 135 f.; position of disciples on death of Jesus, 139 ff.; way to, still through Judaism, 141 ff.; Apostles and primitive Christians continued Jews, 144 f.; development of, 317 ff.
Chrysostom, p. 28, 37, 216 n. 1, 233, 331.
Clement of Alexandria, p. 27, 332.
Clement of Rome, alleged evidence for Acts, p. 3 ff.
Clementine Homilies, p. 21, 307 n. 1.
Corinth, parties in, p. 307 ff.
Corinthians, Ep. to: 2, xii. 12, p 338 ff.; 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff., 344 ff.; 2, xii. 2 ff., p. 557 ff.
Cornelius, conversion of, p. 186 ff.
Cyril, p. 331.

Decree, The Apostolic, p. 256 ff.
Diognetus, Ep. to: alleged evidence for Acts, p. 21 f.
Dionysius of Corinth: alleged evidence for Acts, p. 23 f.
Döllinger, von, p. 355, 358 f.
Dorcas. *See* Tabitha.
δύναμις, p. 329 ff., 336 ff., 351 ff.

Ebionites, p. 28, 316.
Ebrard, p. 94 n. 3, 96, 431 n. 3.
Eichhorn, p. 79 f.
Ellicott, Dr. (Bishop of Gloucester), p. 205 n. 1, 338 f.
ἡμεῖς sections, p. 40 ff., 43 ff.
ἐνεργεῖν, p. 336 f., 352 f.
Epiphanius, p. 35 f., 216 n. 1, 316.
Epistles, The Catholic, p. 321 ff.
Erasmus, p. 513 n. 1.
Eunuch, p. 182 n. 4.
Eusebius, p. 18, 20 f., 23 f., 35, 216 n. 1, 424.
Ewald, p. 37 f., 188, 240 n. 1, 298 n. 1, 335, 385 n. 1, 544 n. 1.

Farrar, Dr., p. 102 n. 3, 411 n. 3, 423 n. 4, 426, 468 n. 2, 469 n. 1, 477 n. 1, 490 n. 3, 535 f., 561 n. 1.

Galatians, Ep. to the, ch. iii. 5, p. 336 ff.
Galilee, did disciples go into, after crucifixion? p. 102 ff.
Gaza, p. 181 f.
Gfrörer, p. 490 n. 3, 523 n. 1.
Gospels, Evidence of the: bearing cross, p. 410; vinegar and gall, 411 f.; hours of the Passion, 412 f.; inscription on cross, 413 f.; parting garments, 414 f.; the two malefactors, 415 f.; the penitent thief, 416 f.; mockery of the crucified, 417 f.; the beloved disciple and women by the cross, 418 f.; the words on the cross, 419 ff.; Eli, Eli, 422 f.; the great darkness, 423 f.; the veil of the Temple, 424 f.; resurrection of the Saints, 425 ff.; the earthquake, 427; the centurion, 429 f.; the Crurifragium, 430 ff.; the wound in the side, 434 f.; Joseph and Nicodemus, 436 f.; the entombment, 436 ff.; the spices, 440 f. Isaiah, ch. liii. 441 ff.; watch by the sepulchre, 443 ff.; the resurrection, 446 ff.; according to Matthew, 447 ff.; according to Mark, 451 ff.; according to Luke, 453 ff.; according to fourth Gospel, 454 ff.; vision of Mary Magdalene, 456 ff.; journey to Emmaus, 459 ff.; appearance to the Eleven according to Luke, 461 f.; according to fourth Gospel, 462 ff.; incredulity of Tho-

mas, 465 ff.; appearance related in Matthew, 467 ff.; conclusion from evidence of Gospels, 475 ff.
Griesbach, p. 471 n. 1.
Grotius, p. 35 n. 4, 252 n. 5, 339 n. 5.
Guericke, p. 335.

Hase, p. 120 n. 4.
Hausrath, p. 491 n. 4.
Hebrews, Ep. to the, 321 f.
Hefele, p. 8 n. 4, 11 n. 1.
Hegesippus: alleged evidence for Acts, p. 18; on James, p. 121 n. 2.
Heinrichs, p. 152 n. 2.
Heracleon, p. 26.
Hermas, Pastor of: alleged evidence for Acts, p. 8 ff.
Herschel, Sir John, 528.
Heumann, p. 33, n. 3.
Hibbert, Dr., 532.
Hilgenfeld, p. 135 n. 2, 243 n. 3, 384, 501, 558 n. 3.
Holsten, p. 524 n. 2.
Humphrey, p. 151 n. 4, 182 n. 4.

Ignatian Epistles: alleged evidence for Acts, p. 10 ff
Irenæus, p. 2, 27, 33, 34, 40, 216 n. 1, 365.
Izates, king of Adiabene, p. 138 n. 2, 193.

James, head of Ch. of Jerusalem, p. 91, 210 ff., 247 ff., 258 ff., 283 ff., 306 ff.
Jerome, p. 35.
Josephus, 425 n. 4, 475.
Jowett, Dr., p. 216 note, 282, 284 n. 3, 311, 313 n. 1, 502 n. 1.
Judas, death of, p. 19, 99 ff., 106 ff.
Justin Martyr: alleged evidence for Acts, p. 15 ff.

Kähler, p. 94 n. 2.
Kirchhofer, p. 8 n. 3, n. 4.
Kuenen, 325 n. 2, 487 n. 5.
Kuinoel, p. 152 n. 2, 188.

Lachmann, p. 292 n. 2, 410 n. 2.
Lange, p. 33 n. 2, 36 n., 183.
Lardner, p. 8 n. 3, 20 f., 23.
Law, Mosaic: Jesus did not abrogate, p. 123 ff.; he and disciples observed it, 127 ff.
Lekebusch, p. 78 ff., 175 ff., 259.
Lightfoot, Professor, p. 19 n. 4, 21 n. 1, 25 n. 3, 138 n. 3, 142 n. 3, 143 n. 2, 208 n. 1, 3, 226 n. 1, 227 n. 2, 255 n. 2, 269 n. 1, 307, 326 n. 337 n. 2.
Lincoln, Bishop of: *see* Wordsworth.
Lucius, p 34 n. 1.
Luke: first mentioned as author of Acts and Gospel by Irenæus, p. 2; evidence regarding him, 33 ff.; as painter, 35; the beloved physician, 36; one of disciples at Emmaus, 36 n.; no evidence that he travelled with Paul, 39 ff.; connection with ἡμεῖς sections, 40 ff.; not author of Gospel and Acts, 50; author of diary, 56 f.; called to preach, 59 n. 3.
Luther, p. 67, 532 n. 1.

Manichæans, p. 28.
Marcion, p. 22, 37, 231 f.
Marcionites, p. 27.
Mayerhoff, p. 59.
Melito of Sardis, p. 24.
Messiah, Jesus the; the distinguishing belief of primitive Christianity, p. 116 ff.; representation of, in Gospels, 115 ff; the Suffering Messiah, 119 ff.
Messianic prophecies: alleged, p. 83 f., 441 ff., 486 ff.
Meyer, p. 152 n. 2, 181 n. 6, 233 n. 3, 240 n. 1, 2, 243, 259, 280, 298, 370 f., 422 n. 6, 429, n. 3.
Milman, p. 426 n. 3, 535 f.
Miracles: in Acts, p. 1 f.; evidence of Paul for, generally, 325 ff.; no writer claims to have himself performed one, 325 ff.; Paul's alleged claims, 328 ff.; supposed reference, Gal. iii. 5, 336 ff.; 2 Cor. xii. 12, 338 ff.; 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff., 344 ff.; gift of tongues, 361 ff.
Muratori, Canon of: *see* Canon.

Neander, p. 140, 150, 155, 188, 370, 374.
Nicolaitans, p. 315 n. 1.
Nitzsch, p. 332 n.

Œcumenius, p. 233.
Oertel, p. 259
Olshausen, p. 35 n. 4, 74 n. 1, 151, 152 n. 2, 337 n. 1, 446 n. 1.
Origen, p. 27, 35 n. 4, 331, 365, 435.

Paley, p. 126 n. 2, 215 n. 2, 223 n. 2, 224, 227, 521.
Papias: alleged evidence for Acts, p. 19 f.
Paul, Apostle: connection with Luke, p. 33 ff.; his statements disagree with Acts, 51 ff.; imperfect account of, 55 ff., 68 ff.; parallelism with Peter, 70 ff.; speech ch. xiii. compared with Peter's speeches, 84 ff., 90 ff.; his genuine Epistles, 112; shows no knowledge of Stephen, 149 ff.; his rebuke of Peter at Antioch, 196 ff., 242 ff., 282 f.; his visits to Jerusalem, 202 ff.; conduct after conversion, 204 ff.; his first visit to Jerusalem, 207 ff.; his vision in Temple, 215 f.; his second

visit to Jerusalem, 216 ff.; not second visit of Acts, 219 ff.; third visit of Acts, 221 ff.; discrepancies of two accounts, 224 ff.; motive of visit, 227 ff.; the public congress, 230 ff.; speech, 246 f.; ignores and excludes Apostolic decree, 267 ff.; circumcision of Titus, 274 ff.; ironical expressions regarding Apostles, 278 ff., 311; understanding with the Three, 281 ff.; Gospel of the uncircumcision, 285 ff.; his mission according to Acts, 287 ff.; priority of Jew examined, 289 ff.; circumcision of Timothy, 294 ff.; Paul in Acts not historical, 303 ff.; Paul and the Twelve, 303 ff.; systematic opposition to, 305 ff.; Corinthian opponents, 306 ff.; denunciation of, in Apocalypse, 313 ff.; said not to be a Jew, 316; genuine Epistles of, 323; evidence for miracles generally, 325 ff.; reference to signs and wonders, 328 ff.; Gal. iii. 5, 336 ff.; 2 Cor. xii. 12, 338 ff.; signs of the Apostle, 338 ff.; charismata, 344 ff.; no practical trace of their operation, 356 ff.; Tongues, 361 ff; does not mean power of speaking foreign languages, 381 ff.; interpretation of Tongues, 385 ff.; nervous temperament of, 393 ff.; stake in the flesh, 489 ff.; value of his opinion of supernatural, 396 f.; importance attached to his testimony, 398 ff.; evidence for Resurrection, 482 ff.; source of his information, 483 ff.; appearances compared with Gospels, 489 ff.; value of the evidence, 496 ff., 502 ff.; his own vision of Jesus, 498 ff.; effect upon Paul, 505 ff.; was he converted by vision? 505 ff.; narrative in Acts, 509 ff.; result of examination of his evidence for Resurrection, 519 f.; vision hypothesis applied to vision of, 550 ff.; his constitution and temperament, 556 ff.; his visions and revelations, 557 ff.; process of conversion, 559 ff.; practical denial of Resurrection at the time by, 564 f.; life and teaching of Jesus neglected by, 566 f.

Paulus, p. 334.

Persecution, the first, p. 179 f.

Peter, Apostle: in Acts, p. 64, 68 ff.; parallelism with Paul, 70 ff.; speech at Pentecost, 82 ff., 94 ff; Peter's speeches compared with Paul's, 85 ff., 90 ff.; alleged analogy between language of speeches in Acts and Epistles, 92 ff.; speech, Acts i. 16 ff., 99 ff.; sent to Samaria, 180 f.; at Lydda, 183; at Joppa, 184 ff.; conversion of Cornelius, 186 ff.; living with Simon a tanner, 193; inconsistent with his conduct at Antioch, 196 ff., 242 ff., 282 ff.; speech at Council, 236 ff.; relation to Paul, 305 ff.

Peter, first Ep. of, p. 322 f.

Philip: in Samaria, 180 f.; and the Eunuch, 181 ff.

Philo, p. 378 f., 558.

Phlegon, p. 424.

Photius, p. 28.

Polycarp, Ep. of: alleged evidence for Acts, p. 13 ff.

Proselytes, p. 137 ff.

Psalms, Messianic: xvi. p. 82 f.; xviii. p. 96 f.; xxii. p. 443; lxix. p. 106 f., 443; cix. p. 106 f.; cx. p. 97 ff.

Ptolemæus, p. 26.

RENAN p. 335.

Resurrection: Paul's evidence for, p. 399 ff.; allegation to be proved, 400 ff.; amount of evidence required, 402 ff.; Acts and Gospels as evidence for, 405 ff.; account in Gospels of, 446 ff.; according to Matthew, 447 ff.; according to Mark, 451 ff.; according to Luke, 453 ff.; according to fourth Gospel, 454 ff.; vision of Mary Magdalene, 456 ff.; journey to Emmaus, 459 ff.; appearance to eleven according to Luke, 461 f.; according to fourth Gospel, 462 ff.; incredulity of Thomas, 465 ff.; appearance related in Matthew, 467 ff.; conclusions from evidence of Gospels and Acts, 475 ff.; idea of, anticipated, 478 ff.; evidence of Paul for, 482 ff.; appearances mentioned by Paul compared with Gospels, 489 ff.; value of the evidence, 496 ff., 502 ff.; the vision of Paul, 498 ff.; narrative in Acts, 509 ff.; existence of Christian Society as evidence for, 521 ff.; hypothesis that Jesus did not die as explanation of, 522 ff.; vision hypothesis, 526 ff.; on the third day, 546 ff.; asserted proclamation at time without contradiction, 561 ff.; argument from belief, 565.

Reuss, p. 232 n. 1, 234 n. 1.

Ritschl, p. 125 f.

Romans, Ep. to the, last two chapters of, p. 330 ff.

Rönsch, p. 332 n. 1.

Rückert, p. 501.

Rufinus, p. 331 n. 1.

SAMARITANS, p. 180 f.

Sanday, p. 326 f., 398 f., 406, 482.

Sanhedrin, could not execute sentence of death without confirmation by Roman authorities, p. 151 f.

Schleiermacher, p 79.
Schulz, p. 335.
Scott, Sir W., p. 530 f.
σημεῖον, p. 329 f.
Semler, p. 334.
Septuagint Version. p. 80, 83, 95 ff., 98 n. 4, 158 n. 5, 249 ff., 377, 441 f.
Servant of Jehovah, Isaiah liii., p. 441 ff.
Severians, p. 23, 27.
Silas, p. 33 n. 2, 58, 59 f.
Speeches in Acts, p. 72 ff.; speech of Stephen, 147 ff.; speech of Peter at the council, 236 ff.; speech of James, 247 ff.
Stanley, Dean, p. 355 n. 1, 362 n. 1.
Stephen the Martyr, p. 24 ff., 88, 146 ff.
Strauss, p. 419 n 5, 437 n. 3.

TABITHA, raising of, p. 184 ff.
Tatian: alleged evidence for Acts, p. 22 f.
τέρας, p. 329 ff.
Tertullian, p. 22, 27, 37, 216 n. 1, 292, 444 n. 4.
Theodoret, p. 331.
Theophylact, p. 85 n. 6, 331.
Thiersch, p. 132 n. 6, 297 f.
Tholuck, p. 93 f.
Timothy: supposed author of diary, p. 57 ff.; of Acts, 59; circumcision of, 294 ff.
Tischendorf, p. 410 n. 2, 429 n. 2.
Titus: supposed author of Acts, p. 60; circumcision of, 274 ff., 471.
Tongues, the gift of, p. 361 ff.; interpretation of Tongues, 385 ff.; unintelligible speech, 387 f.; what its utility for church? 388 f.; as a sign? 389 f.: for private edification? 391; ecstatic speech, 392; in no way miraculous, 392 ff.
Transfiguration, the, p. 480 f.
Tuke, Dr., p. 529 f., 533 f.

VALENTINUS, p. 22.
Vienne and Lyons, Epistle of: alleged evidence for Acts, p. 24 f.
Vision hypothesis: applied to resurrection of Saints, p. 426 ff.; applied to resurrection of Jesus, 526 ff.; applied to visions of Jesus generally, 540 ff.; applied to vision of Paul, 550 ff.

WESTCOTT, Canon, p. 7 n. 1, 8 n. 4, 11 n. 1, 17 n. 4, 18 n. 3, 19 n. 3, 21 n. 1, n. 4, 22 n. 3, 24 n. 2, 321, 325 n. 3, 401 n. 2, 414, 415 n. 2, 3, 477 n. 1, 521.
Wetstein, p. 258, n. 4, 297, 468 n. 2.
Wette, de, p. 151 n. 4, 159 n. 3, 192, 204 n 1.
Wieseler, p. 217 n. 1, 224, 277 n. 2, 385 n. 1.
Winer, p. 240 n. 1.
Wordsworth, Dr., Bishop of Lincoln, p. 35 n. 4, n. 5, 59 n. 3, 157 n. 4, 249 n. 1, 337 n. 2, 352 n. 1.

ZELLER, p. 155, 177, 182, 257, 369 f.

THE END.

BRADBURY, AGNEW, & CO., PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS

00067815

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018